

~~EDUCATION~~

Forty-Fourth

~~LB~~

~~2301~~ Anniversary Conference

~~N24~~

~~1962~~

*National Association  
of  
Student Personnel  
Administrators*

THE BENJAMIN-FRANKLIN  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

MAY 15 1963

~~EDUCATION~~  
~~RY~~

APRIL 1-4, 1962

86-283597

*Trans. L.  
State  
1962*

P R O C E E D I N G S

LB  
2301

.N24

1962

FORTY-FOURTH  
ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT  
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

Officers of the Association

President .....	Fred H. Weaver, Secretary, University of North Carolina
President Designate ....	J. C. Clevenger, Dean of Students, Washington State University
Vice President .....	Harold E. Stewart, Dean of Students, Wayne State University
Vice President .....	J. Juan Reid, Dean of Men, Colorado College
Vice President Designate	John P. Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College
Vice President Designate	Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., Vice-President, Student Affairs, Fordham University
Secretary Treasurer ....	Carl W. Knox, Dean of Men, University of Illinois
Conference Chairman ....	Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students, Kent State University
Conference Chairman-Designate .....	O. D. Roberts, Dean of Men, Purdue University

Executive Committee: The Officers and

William S. Guthrie ....	(formerly) The Ohio State University
James G. Allen .....	Dean of Student Life, Texas Technological College
Donald K. Anderson .....	Dean of Students, University of Washington
Carl M. Grip .....	Dean of Men, Temple University
Noble B. Hendrix .....	Dean of Students, University of Miami
Lyle G. Reynolds .....	Dean of Students, University of California at Santa Barbara
John Summerskill .....	Vice President for Student Affairs, Cornell University
Fred H. Turner, Historian .....	Dean of Students, University of Illinois
Arno Nowotny, Placement Officer .....	Dean of Student Life, University of Texas



## STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

This is a brief statement concerning NASPA.  
It was prepared by our historian, Dean Fred H.  
Turner, for publication in the Personnel and  
Guidance Journal.

Name of Association: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Address: Secretary-Treasurer, Dean Carl W. Knox, 157 Administration Building, Urbana, Illinois.

Purpose of the Association: The purpose of the Association is to discuss and study the most effective methods of aiding students in their intellectual, social, moral, and personal development.

"The institutions which are the constituent members of the Association are represented by those who are primarily concerned with the administration of student personnel programs in colleges and universities of the United States. Recognizing that many specialized abilities contribute to meeting student needs, this Association seeks to provide and stimulate leadership for the effective combination and utilization of all of these resources."

"As the student personnel program is affected by and affects the entire educational endeavor, this Association cooperates with those agencies and associations which represent higher education, government, community resources, and specialized interests in student personnel work." (Article II of the Constitution)

Brief History of the Association: The Association was founded in 1919 by Dean Thomas Arkle Clark, University of Illinois, and Dean Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin. The first meeting was held at the University of Wisconsin in 1919, and the second at Illinois in 1920. The original organization adopted the name, The National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, and this title was continued until the 33rd Anniversary Conference at St. Louis, Missouri, in 1951 when the title was changed to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

From the start the Association adopted the policy of institutional rather than individual memberships and this was formalized in a constitution adopted in 1932.

The association has a long record of cooperative activities with other associations and had taken the lead in some inter-association activities. It has repeatedly surveyed itself on functions -- in 1925, 1928, 1939, 1940, and 1944. Since 1935 the Association has operated a Placement Service available to member institutions.

The publications of the Association have been the Annual Proceedings which are verbatim reports of all conferences since 1919 and a monthly News Letter from the Secretary to all member institutions. Through the years there have been special publications of bibliographies, special papers, reports of studies and casebook material drawn from the Harvard Seminars.

The work of the Association is done by the Annual Conference and Executive Committee and various committees and commissions. In 1962 active commissions are devoted to professional relationships, professional and legal principles and problems, development and training of student personnel administrators, program and practices, relations with the behavioral sciences and religious activities. There are numerous ad hoc and permanent committees devoted to special areas of interest. Since 1925 the Association has worked in cooperation with practically every recognized association of higher education, and in 1938 called the initial meeting with eight other groups seeking to coordinate and improve interassociation relationships. An outstanding activity began in 1954 when the Commission on Development and Training in cooperation with the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and with Foundation support, conducted national and regional studies at the Business School and regionally with the Business School faculty in 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957.

**Membership:** Memberships in the Association are institutional with the official representative designated by the institution. Four year degree granting educational institutions approved by their regional accrediting bodies are eligible for membership. There are 376 member institutions in 1962, representing institutions in fifty states, Puerto Rico, and Canada.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
Officers and Executive Committee .....	1
Note re: Proceedings .....	1
Statement of Principles .....	11

### OPENING GENERAL SESSION

Sunday, April 1, 1962

Welcome and Introduction of Officers - President Weaver .....	1
Remarks Regarding Committees and Intro- duction of Committee Chairmen - Vice President Reid .....	2
Remarks Regarding Commissions and Intro- duction of Commission Chairmen - Vice President Stewart .....	4
Remarks - Secretary-Treasurer Knox .....	7
Announcements and Remarks by Conference Chairman Nygreen .....	9
Introduction of NASPA Past Presidents .....	12
Announcements and Remarks - President Weaver .....	12

### OPENING DINNER SESSION

Sunday, April 1, 1962

Invocation - Dean Hendrix .....	14
Remarks and Introduction of Officers and Guests - Vice President Reid .....	15
Entertainment by the Temple University Concert Choir .....	15
Introduction of Speaker - Dean Anderson ...	16
Address - "The Personnel Worker as an Educator: A President's View" - Dr. Harold W. Stoke .....	19
Announcements .....	27

### SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Monday, April 2, 1962

Conference Announcements .....	28
Introduction of President of NASPA by President-Designate Clevenger .....	28
President's Address - Fred H. Weaver .....	30

### FIRST BUSINESS SESSION

Monday, April 2, 1962

Report on Registration .....	41
Committee Reports - Liaison Representative to American Institute of Architects .....	42
Committee on Fraternity Relations .....	45
Committee on Membership .....	46
Committee on Placement .....	47



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## P a g e

Commission Reports -	
Commission I .....	49
Commission II .....	53
Commission III .....	54
Commission VIII .....	55

### CONFERENCE LUNCHEON Monday, April 2, 1962

Invocation - Rev. Ratterman .....	67
Introduction of Speaker by Dean Henderson.	68
Address - "Some Ideas About the Helping Process" - Dr. Keith-Lucas .....	69

### THIRD GENERAL SESSION Monday, April 2, 1962

Introduction of Panel Members - Dean Turner .....	77
Introduction of Speaker by Dean Alexander.	78
Address - "The Role of the College and University in Preserving the Free- doms of Faculty and Students" - Dr. Louis M. Hacker .....	80 ✓
Discussion .....	93

### MONDAY EVENING SEMINAR I April 2, 1962

Student Discipline: Adapting Continuing Responsibilities to Changing Situations - J. Don Marsh .....	102 ✓
--	-------

### MONDAY EVENING SEMINAR II April 2, 1962

Remarks Re: Subject "New Patterns for Student Religious Groups" - Chairman	
Joseph C. Gluck .....	110
Rev. Charles Albright .....	111
Rabbi Benjamin M. Kahn .....	114
Mr. Bruce B. Maguire .....	117
Rev. K. Arnold Nakajima .....	120
Mrs. Margaret Norton .....	122
Discussion .....	122

### SECOND BUSINESS SESSION Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Remarks - Dean Nowotny .....	144
Committee Reports -	
Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations .....	146

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## P a g e

Committee Reports (Continued) -	
Committee on International Exchange of Students .....	148
Committee on Membership .....	154
Committee on Nominations and Place ...	157
Commission Reports -	
Commission IV .....	160
Discussion and Action on the Report of Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations .....	165
Presentation of Proposals of Commissions V and VI .....	166

## FOURTH GENERAL SESSION Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Conference Announcements .....	168
Introduction of Speaker by Chairman Grip .....	168
Address - "Procedure in Student Dis- missal Proceedings: Law and Policy" - Professor Clark Byse .....	170
Discussion .....	192

## TUESDAY GROUP LUNCHEON April 3, 1962

"Counseling Provisions for the Future" ..	200
Remarks - Chairman Pitcher .....	200
Discussion .....	203

## TUESDAY AFTERNOON SEMINAR VII April 3, 1962

"Significant Developments, Current Issues, and the Future of Testing"	
Remarks - Chairman Gwin .....	214
Address - Robert L. Ebel .....	215
Discussion .....	231

## CONFERENCE BANQUET Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Invocation - Dean David W. Robinson .....	246
Remarks - Chairman Gwin .....	246
Introduction of Guests and Officers .....	248
Introduction of Visitors - Dean Winbigler .....	249
Entertainment - Drexel Trumpet Trio .....	251
Remarks - President Weaver .....	252
Introduction of Speaker - Dean Knox .....	254

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
CONFERENCE BANQUET (Continued)	
Tuesday, April 3, 1962	
Address - "A Sentimental Journey," Dr. Otis C. McCreery .....	255
Presentation of Gavel by President Weaver .....	267
Announcement of new Executive Committee.	268
THIRD BUSINESS SESSION	
Wednesday, April 4, 1962	
Chairman - President Clevenger .....	269
Reports -	
Committee on International Exchange of Students - Dean Netherton .....	269
Commission VII, Religious Activities Director Gluck .....	271
Commission V, Relationships with the Behavioral Sciences - Dean Smith ..	273
Dean Alexander .....	273
Resolution No. 1 .....	279
Resolution No. 2 .....	279
Commission VI, Student Financial Aids Dean Grip .....	284
Resolution No. 1 .....	286
Resolution No. 2 .....	287
Resolution No. 3 .....	288
Announcements .....	292
FIFTH GENERAL SESSION	
Wednesday, April 4, 1962	
Remarks - Chairman Summerskill .....	293
"Institutional Limits Upon Student Freedoms" -	
Rev. Gustave A. Weigel, S.J. ....	294 ✓
Professor John S. Brubacher .....	301 ✓
Discussion .....	308
Memorial Service - Dean Turner .....	319
Closing Remarks - President Clevenger ..	320
Adjournment .....	324



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
APPENDIX A	
Report of Secretary .....	325
Report of Treasurer .....	330
APPENDIX B	
1962 Conference Officers, Committees and Commissions as shown in Program ....	331
NASPA Annual Conference Dates .....	338
APPENDIX C	
Attendance 44th Conference .....	339
APPENDIX D	
Roster of Members, January, 1962, and Revised March 26, 1962 .....	348
APPENDIX E	
Summary of Previous Meetings .....	357

## OPENING GENERAL SESSION

Sunday, April 1, 1962

The Opening General Session of the Forty-Fourth Anniversary Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, held April 1-4, 1962, at The Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, convened at four-ten o'clock, NASPA President Fred H. Weaver, Secretary of the University of North Carolina, presiding.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: On behalf of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, I am privileged to greet you at the beginning of the Forty-Fourth Annual Conference.

The purpose of this meeting this afternoon is not to transact any particular business of the Association, but simply to get our Conference started, and the chief aim is to welcome those who may be here for the first time in attendance at any Conference of NASPA.

As the program unfolds, you will see that many hands have brought many things together to the end that the aims and aspirations of Deans of Students and their co-workers will be fostered by this Association.

We believe that the best way for newcomers to learn what the aims and methods of this Association are is for them to take part in the programs and, above all, to take part in the fellowship of these Conferences.

I am going to introduce some of the Officers of the Association and they, in turn, will introduce some of the Chairmen of Committees and Commissions who have been at work this year and other years to make possible the kind of Conference program that we have. I hope that the persons who have not already met these individuals will take a careful look so that if you have some question about some phase of the Conference, or some aspect of the work of the Association, you will feel free to step up to this appropriate individual and ask him your question.

I think if I were asked to say just one thing -- and that is all I intend to say today -- about NASPA, it is that everything that it does is enveloped in a friendly and cordial atmosphere, and I think that in the years that I have been associated with it the thing that stands out as its principal, its enduring, and its outstanding value is the fact of this atmosphere in which all participants, all delegates, all people who are touched by and who touch the Association soon feel at home and soon feel that it imparts to them something of the intangible value that we hope deans impart to their work in their respective institutions.

In introducing the Officers of the Association, I

would like to start with the two Vice Presidents for this year. One of the procedural matters about the Association is that one Vice President takes charge of the work of the Commissions of the organization, and another Vice President takes charge of the Committees. You can tell about the work of these Commissions and Committees by looking at your programs and you will hear reports later on in the Conference, as may be appropriate, by the Chairmen of these respective Committees and Commissions.

The Vice President who has been in charge of Committees this year is Juan Reid, Dean of Men at Colorado College. I hope Juan will not think it out of place if I mention the fact that when he arrived Friday evening I met him in the elevator coming down, and he said he was just on the way to the desk to get a telegram which he hoped contained good news, because his wife was expecting to become a grandmother that very day. (Laughter) We are all very happy and share in Juan's happiness over becoming a grandfather Friday night.

Juan, tell us a little something about the Committees and never mind the grandchildren. (Laughter and applause)

VICE PRESIDENT JUAN REID: Thank you, Fred. As Fred has mentioned, the Committees and the Commissions do a great deal of the business of this organization in between the annual meetings. At this time, I would like to introduce the people who are Chairmen of these various Committees, and say a little about what each of them does.

In the first place, I am sure all of you have noticed the membership list on page 17 of your program, and also the short statement of purpose and function. This was included in the program, I believe, for the first time last year, and it gives you some idea about what the purpose of each Committee is. Some of these Committees are set up on an interest basis, some are set up on a regional basis, and I will try to give you some idea of which ones, and why they are constituted as they are.

The first Committee, the Committee on Consulting Services, is Jack Stibbs' Committee, and I would like to have Jack stand so you will recognize him, those of you who do not know him. Jack's Committee has just finished putting out the brochure which has been distributed at the desk. This Committee is on a regional basis, and it has 9 different representatives, mainly on a regional basis. There are a couple of extra members; one who represents the Jesuit schools, and another to represent the state colleges.

The second Committee is the Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations. Ray Hawk is not here, but John Gillis will serve as Chairman of that Committee. John Gillis, would you please stand. This Committee is based



mainly on interest and experience -- experience, of course, in the National Student Organizations, and particular interest.

The third Committee is the Committee on Fraternity Relations, and Don DuShane is the Chairman of that Committee. Would Don stand please.

DEAN DONALD M. DuSHANE: Juan, would you mind having Dick Hansford stand, since he has taken over for us in the last week or so.

VICE PRESIDENT REID: Would Dick please stand. Dick was a former Chairman of this Committee who has acted in Don's absence until his arrival here today. This Committee is mainly established on interest, I would say, and with some emphasis on the type and size of institution.

The next Committee is the Committee on International Exchange of Students, and John Netherton, University of Chicago, is the Chairman. Is John here? Would you please stand. He is here and has been quite active, I know. I am sure he has had a meeting of his Committee already. This Committee is mainly constituted by institutions that have a large number of foreign students and have a very good program for foreign students, so most people on this Committee represent institutions of that type.

The Committee on Membership is chaired by James McLeod of Northwestern. Jim is here. It is established on a regional basis, and Jim, this year, has put out a very fine brochure which has been distributed to the membership at the registration desk.

The Committee on Placement -- I am not sure that Arno Nowotny is here. Is "Shorty" here? He is where he should be, upstairs working. This is mainly made up of people who are really workers, people who are interested in working in this particular field of placement, and at each Conference they are kept pretty busy with their placement work.

Fred has mentioned briefly that the Vice Presidents are in charge of the Committees. Actually, they recommend to the President the appointments, and he, in turn, makes them; but in many instances, of course, he can appoint anyone he wishes.

For you who have not had the opportunity of serving on a Committee, I should say that if you are interested in serving, if you have a particular interest, be sure to fill out the form that has been provided at the Conference registration table. Also, remember that Vic Yanitelli -- Vic, you had better stand up so that they know who you are -- is the Vice President for the coming year in charge of Committee

organization. So if you have a particular interest either see Vic or see Jack Clevenger, your incoming President. I am sure they will be happy to know of your interest.

Most of these Committees function by letter during the year, the Chairman contacting each member by letter, and this is where most of the business is carried on; however, there is a provision for Committees to have interim meetings, in between annual meetings, and funds are available if appropriated by the Executive Committee, and several of the Committees have met this way. Some of the Committee reports are in writing and have been distributed. As we pointed out, there have been several brochures and there have been several booklets that have been published as a result of the Committee work. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Juan Reid is also qualified for any legal assistance that anybody might need, because he told me yesterday that he had coached "Whizzer" White in every sport that he took part in. How many sports was that, Juan?

VICE PRESIDENT REID: It wasn't "coached." I was coaching at Colorado College when "Whizzer" White was a star at Colorado College. It was three different sports.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Did he defeat you in all three, is that the point of this story?

VICE PRESIDENT REID: Not every time, but almost.  
(Laughter)

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Everyone knows that one of the necessary qualities to succeed as a dean of students or dean of men is the capacity to remember names. People have all sorts of devices to assist their failing memories in this necessary quality; and I was very much impressed last night at the mastery of one of my associates in this particular. Hal Stewart and I stepped off the elevator just about the same time another man did whom we remembered having seen at the Conferences several times. As I strolled down the corridor right behind Hal, he was saying to his wife, "Doggone it, I know that man's name as well as I know my own." His wife looked back to see the man behind them and said, "Well, perhaps you should know it better. His name is Stewart."  
(Laughter)

I wouldn't dare tell this story except John Stewart, from Maine, who is here, has already heard the news about Hal Stewart's infallible memory. (Laughter)

Now I am going to ask him to speak from notes on the subject of the work of the Commissions of this Association.  
(Laughter) Hal Stewart of Wayne State. (Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT HAROLD E. STEWART: Thank you, Fred. It is a true story. I have only known John 12 or 15 years,

but I had one of those mental blackouts that sometimes occur.

The various Commissions, of which there are eight, are working Commissions, working on one or more problems of considerable professional significance to us deans of students and to the Association. A little later on, you will have reports from all of these Commissions, and like all such reports to assemblies, you will find that some are for it, some are "agin" it, and some have read it. You may even find, as a reporter in our college newspaper wrote about a conference that was held at the University, that everybody jumped on the bandwagon, pro and con. (Laughter)

Commission I is the Commission on Professional Relations. The list of Commissions begin on page 20, and you can read there the basic purpose of this and the other Commissions. Commission I has a very important function in its activity as a liaison body between the Association and several of our closely related professional organizations.

The Chairman this year has been Jack Clevenger, and since he is coming into the soft spot of President of this Association, he has, he informs me, already, as of this date, handed over the heavy responsibilities of Commission I to Don Winbigler -- am I right, Jack?

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE J. C. CLEVENGER: Right.

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: -- as Chairman of Commission I. Will you both stand, Jack and Don. (Applause) I am requested to announce that Don Winbigler is the one with the Toni. (Laughter)

Commission II has, really, a double job. It is concerned on the one hand with Professional Principles and Problems, and has a subcommittee working in that area; and on the other hand with Legal Principles and Problems which, as you know, are becoming an increasingly hot issue throughout our educational system. I would like to present to you the Chairman of that Commission, John Hocutt. John.

Commission III is operating in the important area of the Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators. This program is gradually developing, and I think that the Commission, this year, will have a report which will be of great interest to this body. Dean Robert Shaffer is Chairman of that Commission. Bob ought to be here somewhere. Bob. Bob, are you planning a session at nine -- an open meeting at nine-thirty this evening?

DEAN ROBERT SHAFFER: Nine-thirty, Valley Forge Room.

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: Nine-thirty this evening in the Valley Forge Room. That is on the second floor -- the one above the mezzanine.

Commission IV is engaged in consideration of Program and Practices Evaluation and it is, in a sense, engaged in scholarly pursuits and research activities. Dean Carlton Krathwohl is Chairman of that Commission. Carl is in the back of the room. Are you having a meeting this evening, Carl?

DEAN CARLTON L. KRATHWOHL: Nine-thirty in the Jefferson B Room.

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: Nine-thirty in Jefferson B.

Commission V, Relationships with the Behavioral Sciences, is an area which I am sure we will all agree we must explore with ever increasing intensity. This Commission is chaired by Dean Mark Smith, Denison University. Where is "little" Mark? He is a little difficult to see, but if you strain your eyes you may be able to make him out. (Laughter)

DEAN MARK W. SMITH: At least I'm alive. (Laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: You are having a meeting this evening also, Mark?

DEAN SMITH: Yes, but I don't know where.

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: It is scheduled, according to my program here, in Valley Forge B at nine-thirty.

DEAN SMITH: Right. Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: Commission VI, Student Financial Aids. This is a very important part of the work of all of us deans. This Commission is chaired by Dean Carl Grip, Temple University and our host dean for this Convention. Carl, where art thou? He is up hosting. Well, I am sure you all know Carl anyway and have met him.

DEAN NOBLE B. HENDRIX (University of Miami): He has a meeting tonight at nine-thirty in room 1026.

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: Thank you, Noble.

Commission VII on Religious Activities. You will note in your program that there is a major session on this particular area, Seminar II scheduled for eight p.m. on Monday. This particular Commission is chaired by Joseph Gluck of West Virginia.

DIRECTOR JOSEPH C. GLUCK: We will have a meeting tonight at nine-thirty, and we need a place to meet. Do you have an assignment for us?

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: The Lafayette Room, at nine-thirty.

A new Commission formed last year on what we all

recognize as a most current topic is The Student and Social Issues. This Commission has been working on a proposal to submit to a foundation. This proposal has been approved by the Executive Committee, and if our duplicating machinery does not break down we hope to be able to have this proposed project ready for distribution to you for your information. This Commission is chaired by Dean Ed Williamson of the University of Minnesota. Is Ed here?

May I say, as Juan has said, that if any of you are particularly interested, especially interested in working -- and I mean working -- on any one of these Commissions, I suggest that you speak to the Chairman of that Commission, indicating your interest, or to myself, or to Jack Gwin, who will succeed me as Vice President in charge of Commissions. Is Jack here? Clear at the back of the room there. Jack. Or you could speak to Jack Clevenger or, indeed, to any of the Officers.

Mr. President, I think that concludes my part of the program.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Thank you, Hal.

I would like, at this time, to introduce the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, Dean of Men at the University of Illinois, Carl Knox. I think Carl has a special word to say to the newcomers to the Association at this Conference.

SECRETARY-TREASURER CARL W. KNOX: First, I would like to just mention that there are copies of the Annual Secretary's Report available at the registration desk. There are also copies of the Treasurer's Report. There are also there, on blue paper, suggestion blanks which you are invited to use to make any particular comment, suggestions, or an expression of interest, as has already been mentioned by Hal, in any area of NASPA activity.

For those of you who are attending a NASPA Conference for the first time, you will see amongst you a few green ribbon wearers. We have a supply here of green ribbons. This is helpful from the standpoint of, one, the graybeards, the old-timers, can at least recognize you, step up and get into conversation with you; secondly, that green ribbon entitles any of you who wear it to collar anybody with a NASPA tag on and pose any questions which you wish. If you find anyone who has all the answers, there isn't a soul here who won't be happy to chime right in with you.

But I would like to be spotted up at the rear door when this breaks up, and as those of you pass by who do not have one and who are attending for the first time please take one and wear it, from the standpoint of being helpful to the general spirit of the Association.

A point here, because the question usually does come up. All registrants at this Conference will get a copy of the proceedings of this Conference. Is that within five weeks, Leo? I would also like to mention at this time that our Conference Recorder is Mr. Leo Isen, and he has been taking care of the Association for more years than most of the participants. As a matter of fact, four years ago, when I inherited this assignment of Secretary-Treasurer, the one thing I just completely took for granted was the fact that Leo would be here; and some few days before the succeeding Conference, I received a phone call. Leo said, "Hey, is NASPA interested in our services or not?" I said, "Why, of course." I took it for granted.

I would like to make two final points here, because the question is often raised, "Can we get a list of people who are in attendance?" We are going to cut off the names of those registered as of two o'clock tomorrow, and start preparing an alphabetical list. An additional list will be made for those of you who would want a complete list; but I would just like to assure you that come Tuesday morning, halfway in the morning, a roster of those in attendance will be available at the registration desk.

Last, but not least, starting tomorrow we will run a check cashing service at the registration desk. In my four years at least -- I cannot speak for my boss's, Fred Turner's 21 years prior to that -- we have never had a bad one. We have received a few NSF's, understand, but they have always been cleared. (Laughter) I almost thought my faith was going to be shattered this past year. This was about 7 or 8 weeks ago, a \$35 check came through from an individual who said that his check had been returned to him from the Colorado Springs Conference. He was very embarrassed about this. He had put it in his suit pocket, to make it good, and the suit had been given away to the Salvation Army drive. (Laughter) And he was getting his conscience cleared. So, as I say, tomorrow the check cashing service will start (laughter) and we will stay with you as long as the cash holds out. Thank you very much. (Applause)

PRESIDENT WEAVER: I observed that Toombs has escorted the ladies who are in attendance at the Conference into the room, and I hereby declare an interruption of 30 seconds for everyone to cast his eyes to the northwest. (Laughter and applause)

Ladies, you are doubly and triply welcome, and I am sorry that you arrived too late to hear the addresses that have already been made on this program by myself and my associates up to the point of Secretary-Treasurer. But we have reserved to talk briefly now a person whose importance to the Association truly could not be exaggerated. The program arrangements are almost exclusively in the hands of Glen Nygreen, who completes his third year as Program Chairman for the Association this year. As the Conference proceeds, you will hear from Glen

from time to time, and we will have our opportunities to say our thanks to him. But right now, I would like for you to see and hear briefly from Glen Nygreen, Program Chairman, Dean of Men at Kent State University. (Applause)

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN GLEN T. NYGREEN: Thank you, Fred. It is the lot of the Program Chairman to make his inefficiency readily known by the frequency with which he must get up and make announcements, so I trust you won't hear from me very often. The less often I think the better I will have done my job.

The Conference Program is in your hands. It now looks as though it will be conducted substantially as printed there. There are extra copies of the program available at the registration desk, so if for any reason you have need of one at any time during these conferences, please help yourself.

There are many people to whom the Conference is indebted for the program which is before us. Actually, the thing that makes this the fruitful association it is is the wealth of talent and the readiness of its members to make that talent available to professional leadership; and this program represents that.

Three or four announcements which will be repeated later, but are made now so that you will have them in your mind. First, there have been references to several meetings of Committees and Commissions this evening. Those are posted on the wall behind the registration desk, in case any of you lose touch with any of those. Particularly, however, I want to call your attention to an open meeting of John Gillis' Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations. This is scheduled for the Poor Richard Room. The Poor Richard Room is not listed on the program, at the bottom of page 7, so please note that that open meeting will be held in the Poor Richard Room.

If you are uncertain where to go, and if you have no driving interest in the work of one of the groups which is otherwise meeting tonight, we commend to you this group. They will have representatives of a number of national student organizations and this, I think, will be a fruitful discussion for as long as you wish to stay with them.

I want to call your attention to the three reception and hospitality hours. The first is scheduled for five-thirty this afternoon, in the Betsy Ross Room. The dinner tonight will be held in the Garden Terrace, right here. If you wonder if the hotel can get ready, I tell you this is the most efficient group, conference-minded hotel management with which I have ever dealt. At five-thirty you are all invited to the hospitality hour where you will meet the Officers of the Association and their ladies. On Monday, at five o'clock, there being no formal Association dinner scheduled at that time, you may like to meet your friends at the hospitality hour, again

in the Betsy Ross Room, and Tuesday in the Franklin Suite, preceding the Conference Banquet, another hospitality hour at six p.m. We have asked people not to schedule privately operated hospitality functions during this time, in order that we may all share together in a common place. (Laughter)

There is one change on the Tuesday Luncheons. Luncheon B, "Counseling Provisions for the Future," because of the increased interest in that group, that meeting has been changed to the Ballroom Foyer. There is a special room just outside the ballroom which will accommodate more people than the place originally scheduled, so that luncheon will convene there. It will be marked and you will know it. Luncheon C, which is the Table Topics Luncheon scheduled for the Franklin Suite, will overflow and make use of the Commodore Barry Room also.

There are 15 table topics. There are, at the registration desk, sheets on which we ask that you sign up, and if one of these topics proves particularly important to you and you want to discuss it intensively, we ask that you sign that sheet so that you may reserve for yourself a place at that luncheon.

On Tuesday afternoon at two-thirty, again in the Poor Richard Room, we have a Seminar session entitled, "Current Issues," and if now or later you feel that some concern which is very close to you, or very important to you, is not adequately covered in the program someplace, we ask that you take to that session your concern. The Chairman is Dean Roland Patzer of the University of Vermont, and I think I will ask him to stand so that you may identify him. He is down here near the front, and you may get in touch with him. He will be delighted to arrange for any presentations you think important.

On Wednesday afternoon, following the adjournment of the Conference, from one to three p.m. there will be two tours of new campus facilities in the Philadelphia area. They are on page 14. We have a bit of a problem arranging for bus transportation for these. If your schedule is going to permit you to take advantage of these, we ask, if you will, sign up at the registration desk. We will have facilities there to sign up, and we ask that you do this so that there may be adequate transportation available.

I must call your attention to the Conference Headquarters which are located in the Independence Room. This is the room to the right, as we face the registration desk here. It is also the headquarters for the Placement Office. The Lafayette Room is women's headquarters. It is available to them at all times. When it is not in demand for them, Dean Nowotny will be making use of it.

We call your attention also to the exhibit areas surrounding the mezzanine. You will find there a series of publi-



cations in our field, with a very nicely prepared printed brochure listing these books by title, author, and publisher. This exhibit was prepared by Associate Dean of Men Robert Crane of the University of Illinois who, unhappily, is ill and not with us this year. You will find that well worth any time you spend purusing and becoming acquainted with those publications. Carl, there are plenty of copies of that brochure in case people want to pick up extra copies to take home to their staff associates, are there not?

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: Absolutely.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: So if that little printed brochure on those publications is helpful to you, check with Carl and take a supply of copies.

Also, some models of these new facilities in this area are distributed in the area round about. I must call your attention to the fact that those models are very expensive and, should you have occasion, to take special care of them, it would be appreciated.

The program each year is an amalgam and part of the creative imagination of your Executive Committee and, in part, of the suggestions which come from the members in this Annual Conference. There are two ways by which you can express your interest and concern for next year's program. One is to respond to an evaluation instrument which will be distributed to you by the incoming Conference Chairman shortly after the conclusion of this meeting. The other is to speak to him or to our incoming President in person. You have met Dean Jack Clevenger, our new President to be for next year. I wonder if the new Conference Chairman, Dean O. D. Roberts of Purdue, is in the room. This is O. D. Roberts, and I am sure he would be most grateful for your frank and open expression of anything you want to say about the next program, or what you did not like about this one. I will not be there so you can say what you please.

As a final item, I want to introduce three men who are your host deans for this Conference, and I wonder if they won't come down front. Didn't we see Carl Grip come in? Carl, would you come down front? Here he comes. And Bill Toombs.

DEAN CARL M. GRIP, JR: I think I have already seen everybody.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: I think you have seen everybody, Carl. All right, Bill Toombs from Drexel Institute of Technology who prepared our women's program. Is Bill here? Well, he may be about his business, which certainly is delightful. And Bob Longley, from the University of Pennsylvania. Is Bob Longley in the room? Well, Carl is here. You can speak to Carl.

I think, Fred Weaver, those are the announcements.

I trust there won't be many more for the rest of the time. Remember the Betsy Ross Room, five-thirty, and then down here at seven for the dinner. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: We have introduced the President-Elect Jack Clevenger in another connection, and also Vice President-Elect Vic Yanitelli, but I do not believe we introduced John Gwin, another Vice President-Elect, of Beloit College. Is John here? Back there, in the back row, standing up.

These will be the Officers next year. I had not really intended to introduce the former Presidents but they are so neatly arranged and so well ordered here in the front row (laughter) it is such an exhibit that I cannot resist. I would like to present the former Presidents of NASPA, not in order of seniority. I will start with Ted Baldwin of Cornell University. Ted Baldwin. Don Winbigler of Stanford University. He has already stood once.

DEAN DONALD H. WINBIGLER: The name is "Winbugler."  
(Laughter)

PRESIDENT WEAVER: He said he was "Windblown" on TWA last night. (Laughter) Jack Stibbs of Tulane University. John Hocutt of the University of Delaware. Fred Turner of the University of Illinois. Don DuShane of Oregon University is in the room. And I guess Arno Nowotny, also a former President, is still in the Placement Headquarters in the Independence Room. I would like to stress that location because perhaps some of you will want to talk to Dean Nowotny and his associates there in the Independence Room at the Placement Office, next to the registration desk on the mezzanine.

I would like to call to the attention of the members of the Executive Committee that we will have a meeting at luncheon on Tuesday at twelve-fifteen. The place of the luncheon is not determined. We probably will go into the coffee shop and just occupy a table, but some of you perhaps have bought tickets for another luncheon at that time. If you have, let me suggest that you turn the tickets in because I don't think those tickets will be useful in the coffee shop. Members of the Executive Committee please return any tickets that you may have bought for luncheon Tuesday so that we can have an independent meeting at luncheon in the coffee shop; twelve-fifteen, Tuesday.

I would like to ask if Dr. Allen Barton is here, from Columbia University. Is Dr. Barton here? I stated to Dr. Barton that I would call to the attention of the delegates to this Conference that Columbia University is undertaking a study of student discipline, with particular reference to matters of dishonesty in academic work, and he asked me to determine whether any institutions represented here would like to take part in that national study. He was invited to come to the Conference and I have no doubt that he will. I would just like

to let you know, in the event that you might be interested, that Dr. Allen Barton will be here and he will be interested in talking with representatives of institutions who might desire to learn more about his projected study and possibly take part in it.

I wish I could think of something to say that would cause the persons to understand, in the way in which I would like to state it, how much we hope that each of you will take advantage of the opportunity that you have at this meeting to get acquainted with persons who have been in work in some way comparable to the work that you are in, and possibly will continue to be in for sometime, without any undue hesitation or inhibition or feeling that you need a formal introduction.

I had a sentiment like this with respect to the services and the general demeanor of our church, back in Chapel Hill; and at one of the occasions when we had a social hour, instead of the usual bible class after the service, I made a remark to some of my friends standing around that I was so sorry that we were not more friendly in our church. I had been to a church in a neighboring town where the people greeted you with such friendliness and cordiality that you really could not resist a feeling of good will and friendship for the congregation because you were made to feel very much at home, and were very warmly greeted by all of the members of the parish.

I understood one of the difficulties though when one of my friends said to me it was a wonderful spirit and feeling that I had about it, and he had had the same feeling once, and once had even tried to extend the glad hand of fellowship at the entrance to the church, until after about the third time when he went up and greeted somebody and said, "Welcome to the church; we are so glad to have you here, and where are you living?" he had the reply: "I've been living in the same place for 17 years and I've been coming here every week during that time." (Laughter)

Please do not stand back in fear that you might make a mistake and greet someone who has been here before because we think it will advance our purpose if we manage to conduct a good deal of business outside the formal sessions, in the corridors, in the lobby, and around the tables in our respective meetings.

I would like to ask now if there is any question or suggestion to come from the floor? Is there anything that anyone has to say or to add? Then I believe that the next scheduled activity is the hospitality hour at five-thirty in the Betsy Ross Room, and we hope to see you all there. This meeting is adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at five o'clock ...

## OPENING DINNER SESSION

Sunday, April 1, 1962

The Conference reconvened at seven o'clock, Vice President J. Juan Reid, Dean of Men, Colorado College, presiding.

CHAIRMAN REID: Will you remain seated. We will have the introduction by Noble Hendrix.

DEAN NOBLE B. HENDRIX (Dean of Students, University of Miami): As I came into this meeting, I saw a gentleman from North Carolina and one from Georgia, and with great pride I told them just what I had come from and where. I had been at the Union League Club -- I, out of the heart of Alabama, had been at the Union League Club. Really, what I am doing is testing to see whether this microphone is working. (Laughter) If it is, will you please join me in prayer.

Eternal God and Father, author of our lives and Creator of the framework within which we live: We come from our various stations of duty to this meeting. We ask Thy blessing on the work of those who have planned our program and on those gifted leaders who have come to share with us their knowledge, their understanding and wisdom, their inspiration. We pray that this Conference may become a high point in the service of this Association to its members. Send Thy grace on speakers and listeners, discussion leaders and participants that it may be so.

We raise the voice of prayer with faith that the fundamental aims of the great enterprise of which we are a part are in consonance with Thy eternal purposes -- in fact, come from Thee. Deepen our understanding that it may become a nearer and firmer grasp of Thy eternal truth. Broaden our compassion that our encounter with this generation of college youth may be marked by constant awareness that they are Thy children, carrying, each in himself, some traits, some reflection, some spark of Thee. Increase our wisdom and skill that we may be a worthy part of the bridge over which the young people of our day may move to meet the challenge of their mature years.

As we go about the affairs of this Conference, grant us again the joy of old friends met again and new friends made in the bonds of the profession. Bless and increase the sense of comradeship which has been the mark of this organization. Grant us fruitfulness both in our personal lives and in the development of the profession we serve and love. Accept our grateful thanks for those great spirits who brought this Association into being and all who have labored to make it an effective instrument.

In its work, and in the service we render, each on his own campus, give us wisdom and courage to be worthy of the

calling we follow, and if the work of our hands and our days is found truly sound in Thy sight, establish it in strength for the service of Thy Kingdom. Amen.

... Dinner was served ...

CHAIRMAN REID: Ladies and Gentlemen, your attention please, and we will get the program under way. This Opening Dinner Meeting is the opening dinner for the Forty-Fourth Annual NASPA Conference, and it is one of the few exceptions that this Conference has held in the East, and I am sure that I speak for everyone who is West of the Mississippi, particularly those of us who are from the Rockies, or farther West, that we are delighted that this particular site was chosen, and also we are particularly delighted with our hosts and our host institutions.

One of the obligations of the presiding officer at this meeting each year is to present the members of the Executive Committee, and I would like to do that at this time.

I am sure all of you know Fred Weaver, and he needs no introduction. I am going to introduce him, however. By the way, hold your applause until we are through with the complete line-up. Fred Weaver, our President. I will call them off in the order of their seating, and in that way they won't have to stand. Starting at the other end, Hal Stewart, our Vice President. Jack Clevenger, President-Designate. Don Anderson, outgoing Vice President. Carl Grip, our genial host. Carl Knox, Secretary-Treasurer. O. D. Roberts, who will be our Program Chairman for next year. And, of course, Noble Hendrix, who gave our invocation.

Down at the lower table, we have Glen Nygreen. I think he deserves a real compliment for his calculations. He guaranteed 250 people, and he set up for 300, and we had 299 come in to be served. I think that is really figuring it down to the last variable. John Summerskill is next. John Gwin, an incoming Vice President. Vic Yanitelli, another incoming Vice President. Jimmy Allen, Texas Tech. Don Winbigler, Stanford. Dave Robinson, Emory University. Mr. NASPA himself, Fred Turner. And on the end, Jim McLeod, Northwestern.

Of course, I should recognize the wives. I won't introduce them, at their request; and by the way, the wives, with one obvious exception, are all seated at one table here. I think they are pretty good evidence of the good taste and the excellent judgment that deans of men and deans of students have.

At this time, I would like to call upon Cal Grip to introduce our next part of the program.

DEAN GRIP: Will somebody in the back of the room go out and tell those people out in the foyer to come in. One of the things that makes us very proud at Temple is our musical

organizations. I am very happy to have the opportunity tonight to present to you one of our groups. The Temple University Concert Choir has for many years sung with the Philadelphia Orchestra here in Philadelphia, and in Carnegie Hall in New York. At the tenth anniversary of the United Nations, which some of you may have witnessed on television, they were chosen to sing. Their performance there so touched Dag Hammarskjold that he told his close friends about it and, therefore, when the United Nations lost Dag Hammarskjold some of the people who had been close to him asked the choir if they would come back there to sing at his memorial service.

During the past week, they have been recording for Columbia Records an album of Christmas Carols, which I understand will be distributed next fall; and they are also, this spring, recording for Columbia the Bach B Minor Mass.

It is with great pleasure that I present to you the Temple University Concert Choir, under the direction of Robert Page. (Applause)

... The Conference was entertained by the very beautiful and wonderful musical selections of the Concert Choir of Temple University ...

CHAIRMAN REID: Thank you, Robert Page and members of the Temple University Concert Choir. A real treat indeed.

At this time, I would like to have Don Anderson introduce our speaker of the evening. Don Anderson.

DEAN DONALD K. ANDERSON (Dean of Students, University of Washington): When our friend Juan introduced the Executive Committee and the wives a few minutes ago, I am sure you all noted that there was quite a discrepancy in numbers, which I think needs explaining in terms of the fact that there are some of us who do not have our wives here, and some of us have a different excuse than Father Yanitelli. (Laughter) I was especially disappointed myself tonight that Mrs. Stoke could not be with us, with President Stoke. She is much more decorative than he is. (Laughter)

I talked to her last night and discovered that President Stoke took himself away from a birthday party with his grandchildren this afternoon in order to be with us tonight, and I am certain that all of you join me in thanking him for this sacrifice, and I know you will thank him after he speaks for the wisdom that he brings as a keynote to this Conference. It is a special pleasure for me to have the honor to introduce an old friend and former colleague. He is a man whom I admire and whose friendship I sincerely cherish.

There is an old story -- and I'm afraid it is a very old one -- about a man who had suffered for many years with a most peculiar annoyance. He had a Phillips' head screw in his navel. (Laughter) Glen, may I continue? (Laughter)

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: You're on your own.

DEAN ANDERSON: It really doesn't get any worse than this. (Laughter) But after a number of years of this, he finally was persuaded to go to a psychiatrist who told him that he undoubtedly could, by concentration, relieve himself of this frustration. He told him to go home, to have a couple of highballs, have a good dinner, get himself thoroughly relaxed, go to bed, and before he went to sleep to turn out the light and to concentrate on this problem and to tell himself over and over again, "I no longer have the Phillips' head screw in my navel."

This he did. He had a couple of drinks, he had a good dinner, he got thoroughly relaxed, he went to bed, he read for a bit, and when he got good and tired he turned out the light and he concentrated on this fact, and he eventually went to sleep.

He woke up in the morning, and the first thing he thought of was this problem that had vexed him for some fifteen years. He looked down, and lo and behold, the Phillips' head screw was gone. This thoroughly delighted and amazed him, of course. He looked over on the dresser and there was the Phillips' head screw, and he jumped up to have a look at the thing, and his rear end fell off. (Laughter)

I have two reasons for telling this story. (Laughter) One is that I was instructed to get you in a jolly mood to hear a college president speak. (Laughter) I can assure you that Dr. Stoke is going to be neither ponderous nor pedantic. But secondly, I think there is a certain symbolism in this (laughter) to the speaker's subject. If the corpus of this frustrated man may be regarded as the whole body of higher education, I think you will recognize that the student personnel program is the obvious rear end. (Laughter) I think you will recognize further that the Phillips' head screw is the student personnel worker's role as educator. (Laughter) In other words, that the Phillips' head screw is symbolic of our acting like educators, as we should. If we are not to so act, we certainly are going to be the rear end that falls off. (Laughter) And the President is going to provide the kind of intelligence that is not going to monkey around with any spare Phillips' head screw. (Laughter)

Our speaker tonight is a man of many parts and many talents. (Laughter) If the old saw that a dean is a man who is not smart enough to be a professor but too smart to be a president is true, I am quite convinced that Dr. Stoke's intelligence is varied with time. He once told me in Seattle that he never again wanted to be a president, having previously been president of the University of New Hampshire, and of Louisiana State University. But here he is again as President of Queens College and bringing us a president's view of student personnel work.

Interspersed with his various presidencies has been his deanship of the Graduate School of the University of Nebraska, and the University of Washington, and of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at New York University. Also, at one time, he served as Associate Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin. He is a Past President of the Association of American Graduate Schools. In other words, he has been a leading figure not only in graduate education but, indeed, in higher education overall in America for the past twenty years. In addition, he has played important roles with the Tennessee Valley Authority, with the Bureau of the Budget, with the National Science Foundation, with UNESCO, with the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and many other educational, governmental, and professional agencies. Between his deaning, his presiding, and other activities, President Stoke apparently has not been smart enough to be just a professor since about 1940.

In preparation for the pleasant task of introducing him, I have been rereading Dr. Stoke's delightful and insightful little book "The American College President," which was published in 1959 by Harper & Bros. If you have not read it you have missed a rare treat, and I would urge you to do so.

In case Dr. Stoke does not use some of the material from a wonderful little chapter on the President and the Student, I would like to share just a sentence or two with you. He says, in the beginning of this chapter: "A campus is dead when its students are not there. It hums when they are. Not only are the students themselves galvanic, but they galvanize everyone else, faculty, deans, presidents, and campus police. (Laughter) The annual return of the students inspires in everyone connected with the college the mixed feelings of a happy homecoming and the wariness of a people who are compelled to live in occupied territory." (Laughter)

Another choice passage to me: "The American student invades the realm of ideas as his pioneer ancestors took possession of the country, as if no one had ever been there before." (Laughter)

And speaking of us personally, he has this to say: "Out of all the joint involvement between students and the college there has emerged in the American academic organization a group of specialists in student administration. The functions of these officers vary from campus to campus. In general, they include deans of men, and women, deans of students, housing directors, student counselors, social directors, recreation advisers, and nurses and doctors in student infirmaries. No president could possibly cope with the variety of matters which have to be dealt with without the help of these trained and conscientious assistants." And then this: "They are indispensable. Perhaps it should be said gently that, because it is indispensable, student personnel administration has become something of a cult in its own right, with sometimes resulting confusion as to whether students are



primarily in college to be taken care of or to get an education." I hope that Dr. Stoke will expand a bit on that last sentence, which I think contains something of importance to all of us.

Now, I have taken far too much time, and I would like to present to you President Harold Stoke who will keynote the 1962 NASPA Conference on the subject "How to Keep Your Rear End from Falling Off"; (laughter) or, as the printed program has it, "The Student Personnel Worker as Educator: A President's View." Dr. Stoke. (Applause)

DR. HAROLD W. STROKE (President, Queens College):  
President Weaver, Dean Anderson: I don't know what perverted sense of duty it is that keeps us from having adjourned this meeting as soon as the choir left. (Laughter) I am sure I would not have reported it back to any of your campuses. (Laughter) And that strikes me, for as pleasant a day as you must have had, one of the most interesting and pleasant occasions you could have had. To have followed that climax with a second climax, and then hope for a third climax is quite beyond the bounds of possibility, I assure you. (Laughter)

In the gamesmanship of these kinds of occasions, it seems to be the self-appointed function of the person who introduces the speaker to create as many barriers between him and his audience as it is humanly possible to raise. (Laughter) And no doubt, if you and I succeed in hurdling them at all, in an effort to establish some kind of rapport, either of communication or understanding, it will be a testimony to your endurance, and I don't know what kind of testimony it can possibly be to mine. It can only be to your understanding as well.

But I am happy to be with you because I know that you are happy to be here, and that the annual occasion in which you get together is, for all of you, one which throughout the year you look forward to, and then look back upon as something which is extremely valuable to you in your work, because here, for a few days at least, you get away from the ambushes which no human ingenuity could possibly predict, and only hopefully can cope with. It is here that you can compare notes as to your mutual and common problems. It is here you get that sense of comfort that enables you to go back to your campus sure that the complex problems of dealing with the difficult young are handled a little better there than anywhere else you know. (Laughter) This sense of comfort, after all, is something that is extremely rewarding.

From Dean Anderson's remarks already, I should also add that I am grateful to you for the tolerance of your invitation to me, that you were actually willing for a college president, whose understanding you wish you could get, that you would actually ask him to come and address you. I can only

think it illustrates one of Schopenhauer's more famous remarks, that in the winter even the porcupines huddle together for warmth. (Laughter)

These are the moments of truth, of course, when we get together. And then, speaking of moments of truth, and far away from the beleaguered redoubts that we occupy when we are at home, I wondered if you would enjoy a little verse which I discovered a little while ago, from W. E. Farbstain, which reads as follows:

I sometimes wonder what I'd do  
If I again were twenty-two.  
Would I repeat those foolish flings,  
Mad escapades and silly things?  
And as I stop and ponder now,  
An inner voice replies: "And how!" (Laughter)

Of course, occasions of this kind are a part of a ritual which the academic persons emulate themselves with, and I realize that we both have a kind of an assignment here; that I have been asked to speak, and you have been given the job of listening. Now, if you should finish your job before I finish mine (laughter) I would be glad if you would just raise your hand and I'll hurry. (Laughter) I honestly will -- no, please, not yet. (Laughter)

Program chairmen always hope forlornly that the person they invite to speak will speak upon the subject they asked him to speak upon. It is a kind of a forlorn hope, and tonight Glen Nygreen will feel more forlorn than usual because I should, as a matter of fact, like to speak to you for a few minutes on a question that has been bothering me for some time, in which I have no particular wisdom and ability to answer it, but which I should like to share with you and ask you to think about it, and also help to provide an answer for it.

The question is this: What is there about American higher education that makes so many people like us necessary? Of course, in asking the question I have implied that there is something about American education that makes us necessary, and I have implied that we are somehow distinctive. Both of these assumptions, I think, are sound. But the question which we should undertake to answer is: What is there about American education that makes this so, the great web of things which has surrounded the so-called central operations which go on in classrooms and laboratories of instruction, but which has accrued about it the vast amount of specialized management and administration, the vast amount of service which these operations in American institutions seem to require?

If we assume that the central operations of educational institutions are something that go on in connection with the matter of instruction, the matters of subject matter, of the laboratories and the classroom, we must also face the fact that this has now been ringed about with a degree and a range

of activities which are startling in their complexity and in their magnitude, and which to the educators of many other countries than those of the United States are extremely perplexing. For a few minutes tonight, I should like to address myself to this problem.

You know the range of these activities, of how among our American campuses they include everything from parking to politics, from religion to real estate, from student activities to psychiatry, all beyond the general span of what we would customarily include in education. And in addition to this, it is all taken care of by the specialized staff, which, as has already been mentioned to you, has become indispensable to the operation of our institutions.

I should like to suggest just a few observations as a way of attacking this problem, of trying to answer this question, on three scores. The first is on the effects of the enormous expansion which has taken place in the colleges and universities. The second, the campuses as a mirror, and an increasingly faithful mirror, of the tensions and strains of our society at large. And the third, the problem of an adequate philosophy as to what kinds of institutions colleges and universities really are, and as to what they should be doing.

If we address ourselves to the first of these, we need not spend long about it because there is not a person here who is not acquainted with the statistics, with the discussions, with the planning, with the reports, with the constant preoccupation these days of a vast number of people in American higher education with the problems which accompany its expansion. We know what these dimensions are, the dreadful problems of finding places for the increased enrollment, the space problems of new buildings, the search for adequate finances with which to take care of these responsibilities, the continual competition for staff and for faculty. These are the length and breadth of the preoccupations of college administrators these days as they undertake to gear up this entire enterprise to the new and expanded responsibilities which they meet.

All this has imposed tremendous strains upon everything, including our educational philosophies, for there are people who are not reconciled at all to these changes in American education. But it has also brought out a vast amount of ingenuity. It has brought out a vast amount of resourcefulness in the American academic community.

But still, size in terms of these measurable dimensions does not tell us the full story because these dimensions alone, of staff, and money, and people, are not sufficient to give us the full story. It is a problem in solid statistics, not simply in length and breadth dimensions, in which we find that by multiplying all these factors we have vastly increased the problems of choices before us, choices before the students, before the faculty, before the administration. These now

impose upon us questions of decision which were never there before. We have more possibilities, we have more permutations, than we have ever faced, and this has imposed, then, upon everyone who participates, new and fresh problems.

Let us take just one single illustration: how our lives were complicated by the single act of the Federal Loan Fund to Students. How much counseling these students needed as to whether these loans were for the purpose of, "Now we could buy Mary an engagement ring," or whether they were to pay some other kinds of bills, or whether ultimately some sharp students are going to make money out of Federal Loan Funds. We have new and difficult problems which a single act has imposed upon the length and breadth of American education. And if we were to take that great measure of all our complexities, the day when we register -- and how glad I am everytime registration comes around, how glad I am I am educated. (Laughter) I am sure I could not survive a registration day -- the number and variety of things our students must face when they go through the complexities of registration; and I confess at this distance I have ceased to read college catalogs, as the broken mirror of American education.

I remember, with some poignancy, a little girl on our own campus who told me once, "I have finished today." She said, "I always have one good cry during registration. That is par for the course." I think she has many others who feel the same way.

No wonder we must have a whole priesthood to take care of the complexities which the expansion of size, the addition of our choices imposes upon us. We have not yet adjusted our minds to this, and by virtue of this fact we shall feel a continued strain for sometime to come.

*Societal Representation comes to campuses!*

Let us address ourselves for a moment to the second of the suggestions I offer you, and that is that our campuses are more nearly today mirrors of the ideas, the interests, the tensions and strains of our society at large than they have ever been before. In part, this too is a product also of the sheer expansion of our colleges and universities, but it is more than that. Actually, the more nearly our campuses reflect in large numbers of students all economic and social classes, all religious groups, all racial and political groups, the more will our campuses themselves become the home of the tensions which these bring with them, and which will reflect within our own academic communities a virtual duplicate of that of the social community of which we are a part. Or to put it a little more epigrammatically, as education suffuses our society, we shall find that our society will suffuse our institutions far more than has ever been true before.

But just as our students themselves bring with them the variety of tensions reflected in their own relationship to society, there is more than that. The more of the national income that is spent on us, the more will we be subject to the

scrutiny and to the criticism of society; the more will we be searched as to what we are doing, as to why we are doing it, and whether we should be doing it. The greater the proportion of America's young people who are entrusted to our care -- and we are now the trustees, literally, of virtually all the brainpower which will be running the country within twenty years -- the greater the proportion of America's young people who are entrusted to our care, the greater will be the concern of parents and families whose daily focus of eyes and interests will be upon our campuses.

The more that colleges and universities become a power in the affairs of the nation, from the Peace Corps to Cape Canaveral, the greater will be the tensions and strains reflected in our operations.

Let us take some illustrations, if you will, on the campuses, although each of you can piece out the imperfections of these remarks with your own thoughts. Each of you has your own dynamic and vivid illustrations. The invasion of the campuses, for example, of the trade unions brings us new problems of negotiation, of adjustment, of understanding, and of relationships we have never had before -- the non-academic staffs. They, incidentally, are the ones who brought us the five day week, you know. It was not, after all, the faculties that did so. But with the custodians, the food service, the buildings, and the other trades, we shall find ourselves operating as other institutions in our societies operate, with a care for factors in our society which do not originate on our campuses.

The growth and the management of student activities and organizations, the determined expressions of opinions and social actions about religion, about politics, about social justice, the militant left, and the militant right-wingers, are going to be represented. [Even the techniques now invading the campuses are alien to the academic mind. The borrowing of such techniques as the sit-downs and the strikes are alien to the processes by which academic enterprises have managed themselves -- by reasoning, by investigation, by fact-finding, by compromise.]

You know the illustrations. Some of them hit the headlines, in which you can see the vividness with which young people sit on the stairways of the dormitories of the University of Chicago to force a social point of view. A student writes to me demanding that the Christmas tree lights be taken off the Christmas trees in front of the building because these violate the principles of church and state. "There is no justification for the Christmas tree lights, supported at least from public funds."

Here is idealism, if you please, but here is a sense of urgency and conflict and tension invading our campuses, with which we shall have to deal.

And finally suffusing it all, these days, of course, is that universal bane and blessing of higher education, coeducation; a problem reconciling it with automobiles and with a lot of other things. My own, private view of coeducation has always been, as Dean Anderson knows: coeducation is a wonderful thing for girls, but not for boys. (Laughter) But I have had some difficulty in getting this adequately organized. (Laughter)

All of these things I have been mentioning have given rise to the growth -- and the growth like the green bay tree -- of one of those all-suffusing aspects of our enterprise called public relations; one of the most necessary and one of the most enervating forces which has invaded higher education.

Let us turn, for a moment or two, to the third of these, which to my mind is perhaps more basic to all our problems than any other. (Perhaps the source of most of our perplexity these days, and of a great many of our problems, is the lack of a sufficiently clear and adequate philosophy as to just what kinds of institutions colleges and universities really are, and what it is they should be doing.)

If I were to try to make a summary statement describing them -- which is, of course, always inaccurate to some extent -- I would say that American higher education is full of competent and energetic people filled with missionary zeal and personal ambition which makes them eager to be of service (with a capital S) to the largest number of people and in the largest possible number of ways.

Their very success in doing so has threatened to transform American colleges and universities into what I shall call general public service institutions, good enough in themselves, but which on the whole tend to overshadow and confuse their educational interests and purposes. I am sure I need not recount this at great length because it is a phenomenon that is familiar, to some degree, to us all, on every one of our campuses.

But let me ask you some questions about what a college should be, and then perhaps by trying to ask these questions, or answer them, we can arrive at an answer as to what a college should be.

To what extent, for example, should a college be a welfare agency? How far should it go in providing for the health, even, of students? How far should it go in providing them with finances? How far should a college go in undertaking, in other words, not only to supply education, but all of those factors which enable a student to take advantage of education? Are these its proper functions, or is there a legitimate division of labor in our society that says "These are not the functions of the college; these belong elsewhere"? To what extent should a college be an agency of public entertainment?

Here we run squarely into the vast athletic programs with which we are saddled. And not alone athletics, but how much of the orientation of our music, of our theater, how much of the orientation of many of our programs are these days aimed at a public that is not on the campus? And how much do we determine the level and the nature and the interest and the instruction of these activities in terms, not of the college and of its clientele, but of a public which wants something else from it?

To what extent is a college a public forum, required by the obligations of a concept of academic freedom to provide a platform to everyone who demands it, or who can get himself invited to speak on its grounds? To what extent must a college provide a base from which every idea which floats freely in our society can be given public expression? What is the principle which must decide for the college whether it entertains it or whether it does not? Does it lie in the hands of the college or does it lie in hands outside the college?

To what extent should the colleges be refuges for the uncertain, the dilettantes, and the mediocre, whether in their regular sessions or in adult education? And to what extent should the colleges insist on the rigorous demands which the nature of their mission imposes?

To what extent should colleges and universities be regarded, or regard themselves, as adjuncts of public service, supplied on demand; economists for labor arbitration, sociologists for urban studies, physicists for space shots, experts for foreign aid?

To what extent are we as administrators and faculties ourselves, to what extent are we ourselves free to determine what we shall call a college or a university, and to what extent is it imposed upon us by the compulsions and hard core of the nature of the knowledge in this universe, which we do not describe, but which imposes itself on us and imposes upon us the necessity for its mastery? To what extent are these a matter of necessity? To what extent are the answers to these questions for us a matter of choice?

All of these responsibilities and useful services have brought about, may I say, much blurring and much confusion about the clarity with which we think about higher education. This confusion exists in the public; it exists in our faculties, our students, among our administrators.

May I bring it down more specifically to our particular problem, that of the students themselves. If there is any way in which the general eagerness to be of service is manifest more than in any other, it is the anxiety of the American college to do everything it can for students. We are even sentimental about it. The student arrives on the campus virtually by invitation. He has, long before he comes, been wooed by the

institution, if he is a good student. He has been invited by literature, developed with the techniques of public administration, which are pretty superior these days, literature showing girls, games and real estate. (Laughter) And when he arrives, he expects to find them. (Laughter) May I say, he does so with remarkable success. (Laughter)

Since we are all competing for the ablest student, after all, we tend to flatter him with many attentions. We offer him scholarships; we wish to provide for his finances; we wish in every way we can to make at least the approach and enrollment in the college as simple and as painless and as inviting as we possibly can. After he is there, we counsel him -- oh, how we counsel him. (Laughter) We lend him money. We look after his health. We entertain him. If he gets into trouble we help him. The president addresses the opening freshman class and lays the institution before them with the address, because he won't see them again until four years later. (Laughter) "The college," he tells them "is here to serve you."

Now, after all of this, the student is likely to take this seriously (laughter) and I am not really sure but what he has a right to (laughter) because if he can learn at all, surely he can learn from these repetitions that this is exactly what the college is. Eventually, after he has been told at virtually every turn that the college exists for the students, he takes the idea quite literally and he regards all the people there and its assets, its property, as a kind of a matter of his proprietorship, which are his to command, in no small sense, and no wonder he is a little bewildered then when he finds here and there pockets of resistance; (laughter) a professor who insists that he meant it when he said that the paper should be in on time; that the student should not copy an old report and hand it in. A few of these things cause a certain schizophrenia in which the student who had been led to believe these things now finds that there is something here that is not quite as amiable, quite as appropriate to what he has been taught as he suspected. So we find a certain querulousness and a certain impatience growing up, in which the student, who has been led to believe that the college exists for him, finds himself a little bewildered at any reservations.

The truth of the matter is that it is we, to no small extent, who are responsible for this, that we have misled him, and that we are in part responsible for the very problems, then, which plague us; and that some of the difficulties and the confusions of our students come from this very misapprehension as to what the nature of a college really is, and as to what the nature of their relationship really is.

May I startle you by saying -- if it is at all startling-- the truth is that colleges do not exist for students. If one were to put it even more dramatically, one would say: Students exist for colleges. The truth is that colleges exist as the best instruments we have by which the human race -- or



which we have yet found by which the human race beats back the encroachments of ignorance which constantly threatens to engulf us. Colleges do not exist to serve students. Students exist to serve the cause which colleges themselves exist to serve; and students are in college to prepare themselves to enlist in that cause.

This is quite a different thing, and this is what we have not made clear to our students. Who ever heard of an army which existed to serve its recruits? Or who ever heard of a church whose interests ended with its congregation? And who ever heard of a college that can really carry out its mission when it says, in the sense in which it is interpreted, "It exists to serve the student"?

I think these analogies I have just spoken of are sound, and one of the serious problems we face is to give our students, as a service to them, a different understanding as to what colleges are for. When we do, we can help them find out what they, the students, are for, thus vitalizing their sense of purpose and reducing, I believe, enormously, their inner sense of confusion.

If over these years I have found out anything about higher education, it is that everyone and everything about an institution teaches. It may be the superintendent of property, the social director, the dean of men, the professor of physics; one thing of which I am certain, that everything and everyone around a college or a university teaches by precept, or by example. And in this weltering and this simmering complexion these days, which we call American higher education, the one thing which hopefully we can make all of these teachers unite upon is to have a clarity as to the mission with which the institution itself is endowed.

This, I think then, is the sole message which I would want to leave with you; that it is one in which we all share, in which we find all who are engaged in it indispensable.

Thank you. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN REID: Thank you, Dr. Stoke, for your insights and your concepts. I believe you really understand us.

I have one announcement before we close, and that is to remind you that the Commission and Committee meetings are open, and they were scheduled for nine-thirty, but they will go on as scheduled. I want to call your attention specifically to the Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations.

With this we adjourn.

... The Conference recessed at nine-forty-five o'clock ...

## SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Monday, April 2, 1962

The Conference reconvened at nine-ten o'clock, John C. Clevenger, Dean of Students, Washington State University, President-designate of NASPA, presiding.

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: May I call this Second Session to order. The customary announcements. I have one or two. The Executive Committee is scheduled to meet Tuesday evening and Tuesday at noon. Tuesday noon, the Executive Committee will meet in the Poor Richard Room.

Glen Nygreen has asked us to turn in our luncheon tickets so they will be available. We are in short supply apparently, so a reminder to you men on the Executive Committee to turn in your luncheon tickets by noon so they can be available to the others. We will have to announce later the meeting location for the Executive Committee tomorrow night after the banquet.

... Further announcements regarding Committee and Commission meetings ...

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: The primary purpose of this morning's session, the first morning's session, is to hear the Presidential Address of Fred Weaver. A year ago at Colorado Springs, it was our rich privilege to hear, or to sit at the feet, if you please, of two great men in this organization, Bill Guthrie and Fred Weaver; and we shall certainly long remember their contributions to that fine get-together out there in Colorado Springs. You will recall that at the close of the Conference, you were given an evaluation form and asked to offer comments and ratings on the program and on the speakers.

Conference Chairman Nygreen then collected and collected the evidence and presented the summary of this to the members of the Executive Committee in mid-October. Comments on Fred Weaver's address included, and I quote:

"Fine presentation."

"Best I ever heard at NASPA."

"Best I ever heard anywhere."

"That southern accent really caresses the eardrum."

(Laughter)

"Articulate and intelligent."

And there were many more that indicated our appreciation for Fred's eloquence and knowledge. Now, Fred received this report too, and I wondered about Fred's reactions as he read this report, and then I recall that at Colorado Springs Carl Grip had introduced Bill Guthrie with a graveyard story, and that Bill had immediately responded with his own, you may recall, "Man, that's living" story, about the Texan who was buried with his Cadillac. Not that I want to carry on

this tradition, but I repeat, I did wonder about Fred's reaction as he viewed these glowing tributes in the evaluation, and this reminded me of the story of the supposedly deceased who was being lowered into his grave, and on the way down he noticed the epitaph on the stone which eulogized the almost deceased as "Loving husband, father, faithful friend, great public servant, community builder, war hero," so forth and so forth.

This flowery eulogy apparently disturbed our friend because the graveside mourners were alleged to have heard him remark, and I quote: "Either somebody's an awful liar, or I'm in the wrong hole." (Laughter) Well, tradition will out. (Laughter)

In all seriousness, Fred, we were so impressed with what you had to say to us and how you said it, at Colorado Springs last year, that we have all looked forward with keen anticipation to your Presidential Address.

Fred is well known to all of us who have been associated with NASPA, however, we do have many men and women here for their first NASPA meeting and it is for these green ribbon men and women, it is for our new people that I would recite just a bit of Fred's pedigree. Fred is really a young looking young man. He was a 1937 graduate of the University of North Carolina. He took his Master's in history at Harvard in 1950. He married his charming wife Frances Louise in 1951. His family includes Lewis, aged 9, Margaret, aged 7, Stewart aged 5, who came along with dad and mom to this meeting in Philadelphia.

Fred became Assistant Dean of Students at his alma mater in 1938, and Dean of Men in '46, and Dean of Students in 1948. Fred has had some State Department service too. He served as the American Vice-Consul in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1941 and '42, and followed this with four years of service in Uncle Sam's navy.

Fred has had many distinctions in addition to being both Vice President and President of NASPA, including being the recipient of the Carnegie Travel Grant for Administrators in 1952. He held a Rockefeller Foundation Grant in 1956 and '57. He puts on a somewhat different hat sometimes too because he serves on the Board of Trustees of St. Augustine's College. I notice, from the Who's Who write up on Fred, that he is an Episcopalian Democrat.

Shortly after being elected President of NASPA, Fred was promoted from his position as Dean of Students at North Carolina to Secretary of the University of North Carolina, a position which involves rather broad administrative responsibilities for three public institutions, three fine institutions: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina State at Raleigh, and North Carolina Women's College at Greensboro. All of us were happy to see his state recognize

the scope of his contribution to higher education. Though his new position has taken him away from the direct firing line of student personnel administration, he was eager to carry on his responsibilities to the Association and to the men who have meant so much to him, and for this we are all grateful.

Fred, I am proud to present you to your constituents this morning. (Applause)

PRESIDENT FRED H. WEAVER: Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen of NASPA: I am not the master of the apt story, I regret to say, but I did find running through my mind, as Jack was speaking there, something I heard in the Episcopal church last Sunday at Chapel Hill. Someone was working the New York Times' crossword puzzle and came to the definition "For God, for country, and for Yale." You will recognize this variation, and of course, the answer is "anti-climax." Someone wrote to the New York Times and said, "Surely the designer of this puzzle was a Harvard man." (Laughter) But a letter came back and said, "No, this puzzle was designed by an alumni of Smith College who has been married to a Yale man for 30 years." (Laughter)

There is a peculiar metaphysical problem involved in being an anti-climax to one's self, and yet there is, perhaps, something inevitable about this too. After forty, anything that happens once a year happens often. So it is with Christmas, with birthdays, with the beginning of the school year, with commencement, so it is with NASPA Conferences.

It seems only yesterday that I stood before you in Colorado Springs, and so it must seem to many of you who were there. I want to say that it was not my intention to subject you to this inconsiderate repetition. When I requested last year that I be permitted to speak to the Conference at the beginning of my term as President, rather than at its conclusion, I thought I was making a sensible innovation, and one that followed logically from the arrangement we had adopted of electing the President a year in advance. According to my intention, I should be introducing Jack Clevenger at this time, instead of being introduced by him. But my idea did not find favor with my successor, and I am sorry for I believe that we would all be better off if we were hearing from the man who is about to become President, instead of the one who is about to become a has-been.

But if Jack will not tell us so himself, I can tell you that throughout the year he has been hard at work, as he always is, for the interests and the ideals of this Association, and we shall very shortly begin to witness the gathering benefits of his dedication and his leadership for this organization, for his devotion to the aspirations that we hold for him.

I do not presume to be worthy to address this

assemblage two times within one calendar year on the subject of the vitality of the mission of the dean of students, and his kin, in higher education, and the well-springs of that vitality in the human and spiritual resources of those who dedicate themselves to the work -- although I consider that subject to be foremost in our interests, the bond of our friendship, and the inspiration of our exertions.

Let me today, therefore, refer to my former theme only as much as necessary, to form the setting for what I hope may be considered a few timely and appropriate topics regarding ourselves in our collective aspect -- that is to say, ourselves as the organization known as NASPA.

Last year, I voiced a conception, grounded upon 25 years' experience of the work of the dean, with all of its trials and its triumphs, its rebuffs and its rewards, its grimness and its glory, familiar to us all. While I did not quite say that the dean manufactured the air for the community to breathe, I credited him with singular powers for influencing the atmosphere in which college education takes place. As we all do, I claimed for him a peculiar responsibility for maintaining that precious quality of individual and human regard for students against the inherent tendencies of all institutions toward mechanization, standardization, impersonality, dehumanization.

If I said what was really in my mind, I also made him something more than an ordinary mortal. I vested him with peculiar powers of seeing to the heart of the issues most relevant to the welfare and happiness and the progress of young people who undertake a college education as preparing themselves for lives of usefulness, as members of the human society. Thus did I indicate the value that I put upon being President of NASPA although, to be sure, I did not feel that I deserved to be; and yet, to get something that you do not deserve I have never found necessarily impairs the pleasure or the enjoyment of having it.

Now one year has been added to the twenty-five, and I would like to affirm, in a more than perfunctory way, one thing that I have learned that I did not know a year ago. It is that in this organization the President stands in the nominal place of honor while the place of service and legitimate honor is held by the Conference Chairman, the Secretary-Treasurer, the two Vice Presidents, and the members of Committees and Commissions who work so unselfishly in our behalf. I cannot say too much in appreciation to Glen Nygreen, Carl Knox, Hal Stewart, Juan Reid, and others whom I must forbear to name. As we value this organization we must value their work, for it is they who keep it viable.

It is a remarkable thing indeed that a national organization of more than 300 member colleges, large and small, public and private, secular and sectarian, metropolitan and rural, liberal and technical, eastern, western, northern and

southern, can hold itself together at all. That it does is testimony of the ingenuity of those leaders whom I have named, and also of the pervasive force of our common purpose in higher education. There are, to be sure, differences of professional philosophy among us. We are a widely disparate group by training, by attitude, by the particular way in which we have accommodated ourselves to the academic institutions of which we are a part, and of the scholarly traditions of which we are in part custodians. We are, as it were, an association of many heads, but one heart; or to change the figure, our calling has many doctrines but one creed.

Add to this the vertical change, the change on a time scale that is occurring in our educational arrangements and we confront variety confounded by variety. I refer to the geometrically increasing numbers of students, establishments of new institutions, transformation of existing institutions, fundamental alterations in the professorial profession and in the deanly profession, to the new relationship between education and government. Take simply the whole catalog of factors mentioned last evening by Mr. Harold Stoke, and with this scene before our eyes -- and it is my belief that there are no eyes that see more clearly or more comprehensively the conditions actually obtaining in our colleges than the eyes of the personnel dean -- take this scene and the stage is now set for me to say a few things that I want to say to the Conference of 1962.

The first is that the gentle revolution in American education that is being fed by the manifold changes of population, economic well-being, governmental policy, and world politics, has very special implications for the aspect of education which it is our distinctive responsibility to watch over and to understand.

There are some things that worry me just a little bit. I would like for you to consider whether they are worth worrying about and, if you think they are, to start worrying with me. I would talk about things which traditionally we claim to be within the province of our responsibility.

The first that I would mention is the question of college admissions. To be sure, many gains have been made in developing a scientific and reliable basis on which to judge with fairness and equality and wisdom in determining the admissibility of young people to our institutions of higher education. But it worries me just a little bit that we are forever expanding the basis of objective tests and attaching to the results of these tests numbers which become almost a brand upon high school and preparatory school students around the country, so that it engenders in them preoccupations that become alive in their breasts and in the breasts of their parents earlier, and earlier, and earlier with each passing year.

I sense in this tendency something which, if not the philosophical, certainly the poetic spirit in me rebels against.

I am a skeptic about the ultimate usefulness of this device as a basis on which our philosophy and practice of admissions should be too heavily grounded. I am aware -- in fact, I think I could say that I believe the tendency is going the other way. I think the pendulum is beginning to swing. Harvard already has let it be known, through the Study on Admissions, which Professor Ford was in charge of there, that the College Board tests are no longer regarded as having the force of the laws of the Medes and Persians; moreover, that the optimum student body is not necessarily that which is constituted of high scores on these standardized tests for measuring aptitude and achievement.

But fundamentally, I think the rather abstract concern I have has to do with the rather stubborn belief that intellect and knowledge are not amenable to standardized containment; that they are infinitely variable, infinitely unpredictable, and, we hope, infinitely potential of growth and change.

I could say a lot more. I just want to logic with you that I, for one, am skeptical. I, for one, am a little apprehensive lest the persons who make the tests discover that if they could make the curriculum too, the tests could be even more infallible than they are now. (Laughter) Where this would leave the institutions of higher education and the hope for creative learning, I am not so sure.

I am a little worried about financial aid. I am a little worried about standardization of the criteria and of the procedure for determining worthiness for financial aid. I am a little concerned also that we have reached the point of governmental interest in financial aid, and of possible, more extensive interest in the future, that we may not connect this with its inescapable relation to inflation, and the inescapable relation between inflation and national character.

I learned long ago, at the hands of a German professor of economics, who had been in charge of the war mobilization for Germany in World War I, a distinguished professor named Von Habbeler, that there is a moral aspect to inflation. He told the story of a man in a bank in Germany during the great inflation just after World War I, who came to work one day, when everyone was suffering privations and hard time from inflation, driving a Rolls Royce. His fellow workers in the bank asked him how it happened that he could afford a Rolls Royce. He said, "It was very simple. I made a practice of raking into a basket at the conclusion of the day, at the window where I was teller, all of the marks that had been left there by the customers who didn't think they were worth picking up, until I had collected enough to buy this car"; so he treated himself to the luxury.

I am not forecasting national disaster as a result of inflation, but I am saying that I think it is all too plain to see that the law of economics is going to hold in that insti-

tutions are going to raise the costs of education just about as rapidly as the government or anyone else can supply the funds to subsidize and to assist the students. I am a little concerned about this, not only as to the mode of determination of worthy students, but of the ultimate consequences of shifting over too much to the government, indirectly and directly, and to other outside sources, the financial support for something for which we all know derives quantity in part from the earnestness, and the diligence, and the self-help, and the application, and the hard work that goes into earning the privilege of going to college.

I am worried about this fetish of year-round operation of colleges and universities. I believe that there is a difference between an educational institution and a manufacturing plant. I believe that considerations of efficiencies that hold for conveyor belts in the Ford Motor Company are not altogether applicable for the considerations that hold for the utilization of physical properties or personnel or libraries or anything else about a university and college.

I think that there are considerations pedagogical, considerations educational, which outweigh in importance the economic consideration of whether classrooms or laboratories or athletic fields are being used sufficiently during the course of a day or the week to warrant the expense of keeping it up, or the contribution the state may make or that the endowment may make for the students. Furthermore, I believe that the gaps in education are just as useful to the purposes of education as the periods of intensive study. I think Central Park in New York, which is not used for buildings, is very useful to the buildings that are there. I think that the vacation period, the time when students are not in class, when, hopefully, they are in the woods, securing access to solitude, is just as important to their education as the periods when they are in the library.

We all know what a great thing the students at Oxford and Cambridge make of the fact that when they go on vacation they put more books into their suitcases than bathing suits or golf clubs or other paraphernalia of diversion. Vacation means a time for reading, for independent study, self-motivated application for the consciously held purpose of educating one's self.

I would allow a wide latitude in the time of the student that he devotes, and the way that he devotes it, and if the buildings stand idle during the summer, or during the Christmas holidays, or if one day there are not so many people in the library, I do not count it a catastrophe, and not necessarily a mark of discrimination against students who might be there if it could be used. I think we should approach this question of year-round operation in the loftiest terms that we can bring to bear out of our philosophy of the purpose of universities and colleges.



I am worried about the falling off of interest in student government. We read in the papers of places where students have voiced a preference for world politics over student politics. They have decided that the affairs of the campus are too petty, too insignificant, child's play. "The time has come when we must be concerned with the world at large and we do not have time to govern ourselves". I am concerned lest we might be premature in laying aside some of the well known, established values of student government, of participation in activities, freedom to decide problems for one's self, as a part of the American conception, and, as I believe, the highest conception possible of one's education.

There is a decline in this change of emphasis from self-governing, self-motivated, spontaneous, perhaps uncontrollable, often unpredictable, and often troublesome activities of students. Implicit in this is the fundamental alteration of what we have known as the corpus of students, the undergraduate body, the assemblage of young people who teach one another, who learn from one another, and who by virtue of common membership in this corpus avail themselves of aspects of education which they cannot get elsewhere, and which are fundamental to their purpose.

I am worried about segregation -- I do not refer to segregation of the races; I refer to segregation of the bright from the stupid. I am worried about excessive classification of students according to ability; not that I do not believe that it is well to stimulate the bright to the maximum result possible and to keep them, if I may use inapplicable terminology, operating according to the maximum of their abilities, to be sure.

On the other hand, I happen to put a high premium on the usefulness of the less brilliant student sitting beside a brilliant student, of working at his arm, of being in the same mathematics class with him, of discovering that there is, after all, a difference between Lakeview High School in North Carolina, and Andover, or Exeter, or someplace where a boy comes from. I am not an advocate that you throw them all in the pit together, but I am saying that I think this attention that we give to honors work, superior students, classification according to ability, has within it some perils, has within it the possibility of defaulting on one of the richest things that any undergraduate student body can offer, and that is the privilege of teaching one another and of learning from association the varieties of human intellect, of human ability, of human potential.

I am worried about reforms in education that are prompted too much by considerations of national rivalry.

Perhaps taken individually, these matters, if they be cause for worry at all, are no more than routine and transient problems of growth and administration. But I have a vague feeling -- and I hope it is not sheer perversity -- I

have a feeling that Secretary Ickes had, I believe, when he used that expression, as he looked at the future of the economic structure of America, and he said, "There is a cloud no larger than a man's hand." I have the feeling that there is a change more fundamental than the improvement of standards at work in the tendency away from cherished ideals of American higher education, not to say the American way of life.

I do not assert that because American education has become more conscious of academic standards, of scholastic excellence, that it is also becoming more undemocratic, more authoritarian. I do suggest, however, that to the extent to which such reforms are prompted by considerations of national, scientific and technical rivalry, they hold the possibility of making us become like the thing opposed. They warrant -- and this is the point -- they warrant the full use of our healthy faculty for self-examination and self-criticism.

A friend of mine and I were recently discussing communism and I think I said something like, "Do you really think that American capitalism cannot outdo Russian communism in the long run?" He said, "I don't know. But I do think this: that you cannot beat dialectic materialism with non-dialectic materialism."

American education must have a heavy infusion of that which is characteristically American about it -- freedom, egalitarianism, informality, and a tradition for imbuing it with qualities which we believe foster self-governing capacity, responsible citizenship, and a predisposition for leadership in a free society.

Implicit in all this is an idea that I have that the essential role of the dean of students, or dean of men, personnel dean, has within it what I call a countervailing influence that must be in the academic organization somewhere, a spot, a person, an entity that is sensitive to a more comprehensive view of education than the merely academic, than the merely scholastic, than the merely efficient, than the merely popular. That there must be vested in this person this countervailing influence, not that it discredits these things. Indeed, it is essential that these be understood and that they be exalted; but that there be this more comprehensive, fundamentally human orientation and influence brought to bear.

If it is not plagiarism to read something that I said last year, I will read a paragraph from what I said. "There is to my mind no greater need in this hour for educators and their institutions than to disassociate themselves from the accelerating forces of standardization and conformity, and to restore to themselves the creative and individualistic ideals which are fundamental to liberal education. And what is most pertinent, I know of no element in the family of American education more committed by its philosophy, more habituated by usage, more qualified by wisdom and experience to take the lead in performing this service than the Deans of Students and

their counterparts in the professional group of educators."

Finally, I would like to bring to bear some thoughts as to how these concerns may bear upon the activities of our Association, and how our resources might be projected into the national life through the Association.

We have already made gains. Nothing pleases me more than to have observed in the last few years the success with which our Committees and Commissions have worked during the intervals between Conferences to come to grips with problems which are basic to the success and continued influence of this Association. They are the dynamic of this Association.

The Committee on Membership, the Committee on Consulting Services, the Committee on Professional Relations, the Committee on Training, the Committee on Placement, the Committee and Commissions on Financial Aids and other things, touching the topics which I mentioned earlier, have been at work. They are bringing reports before this Conference this time, and year after year, as they dig in more diligently to these questions and these problems this Association is bringing before its members, and I trust before higher education generally, some of the insights, some of the points of view which should be generated by these people.

We have had at work during the last year a sub-committee of the Executive Committee having to do with the plans for the future effectiveness of this organization. It would be my hope that I could suggest to Jack Clevenger and to his associates on the Executive Committee, and to the membership, several very specific points which I shall merely name.

Number one: That this Association devote itself to a study -- a restudy, if you will -- of the Committee and Commission structure, and to make it possible for these Committees and Commissions to hold meetings during the intervals between Conferences so that it will be possible for continuing attention on the part of this Association to be brought to bear upon these questions -- possibly some of those that I have said that I am worried about and, particularly, if you too are worried about them.

Secondly, that we augment our Secretary's resources and facilities so that it will be possible for him to perform some of the necessary services in order to maintain this machinery of meetings between Conferences, of facilitating communication between Committees and Commissions, of making travel possible, and of being a repository of ready information about such services as placement, consulting, training, publications, and so on.

And my third point is money. This requires a little money. I think the Association should take a look at its budget, get a C.P.A. perhaps, have an accounting made, get a

cost accounting made of our performances in the past, lay out an estimate of the cost of the services which I have just suggested, and then prepare a budget and then bring it before this Association if it be true that a little more money would be a help.

May I just cite the work of Commission VIII as an example? Under the leadership of Ed Williamson, a celebrated Dean of Students, this organization formed a Commission on Social Issues and put that Commission to work at studying one of the most important problems before American higher education, and that is the question of the freedom of students and the limits, if such there be, of their expression, their activities, their behavior, pertaining to controversial issues, social demonstrations, some of the things that Dr. Stoke mentioned last night.

In a sort of unusual action, we were able to finance part of the cost of the meeting of that Commission in Chicago on February 11th. Owing to the hard work of the members of this Commission, and the attention that they have given to this problem, they are ready now to bring in a report of progress. The Executive Committee has already authorized this Commission to go ahead with the study, and we are going to try to raise the necessary money to finance a year or two year study of this question, hopefully with the result that out of this Association of deans there will come wisdom, some light, some new point of view with respect to this question which worries many persons in higher education, and which certainly is fundamental to our education. This is just an example of how we might use a little more money to be effective.

I think attention must continue to be given to the possibility of some regular journal. This year we have produced two little leaflets. The Committee on Membership has printed one, and the Committee on Consulting Services another. Just to see these in print as a tangible demonstration that this Association is at work in these areas is heartening indeed. And I think it will help to create the impression among our professional associates in higher education throughout the country that we are alive and that we are at work. I think we need more of that.

A particularly important connection, I think, for this Association, is with the now pretty generally refurbished American Council on Education. We are at work in trying to establish, in the minds of the persons who govern that Council, that this Association might be helpful in an area which college presidents and others in the higher councils of education are not always prone to count as important.

I wrote a letter to Logan Wilson and said something I knew he would understand, because he used to be a colleague of mine in Chapel Hill; that, of course, we realized why persons who are articulate and influential in higher education take advantage of the first opportunity to get as far removed

as possible from the students. No one can understand that predisposition better than a dean of students. And yet, we cannot help but wonder whether there might not be some question of whether this is altogether healthy, that the higher councils put the work of student personnel deans to bed with the babies. I suggested that he might be interested in some of the thoughts this Association might have. I went up and talked with him, and I hope that Jack Clevenger and his associates will pursue this and see if, in a purely structural way, we can project our ideas on these important questions as they pertain to other institutions and to the government through the American Council on Education.

I would suggest that we continue to develop regional associations; that we develop these because of the growing number of institutions that have become more important.

Finally, I think the Association -- and hold your breath -- should change its name. I will not explore this. I will bequeath to Jack Clevenger (laughter) and this Association the privilege of grappling with this one. But just let me say again, perhaps it is my poetic sense, I believe we might feel more comfortable, I believe we might be more effective, I believe we might even be more successful if we were known as something more kindred to the traditional nomenclature of education than National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

I think the word "Dean" should be in it; not that everybody in it must be a dean, but that "Dean" means something -- more than just something. It is the central word in our doctrine, in our creed, in our philosophy. I think it should be in our title.

I do not advocate a revolution. I only suggest that the ground is moving underneath us and that as an Association we should move at least as fast as the ground is moving, that we walk forward with the motion of higher education, and of institutions, and of government.

Les Rollins said to me the other day something that I told him I was going to tell this audience. I said, "Les, to tell the truth, I am not so sure that the higher councils of American higher education ever do a very great deal." Les said, "To tell you the truth, most of them are nothing more than an Elks Club, but" he said, "there is this difference: An Elks Club doesn't pretend to do anything important." (Laughter)

I do not suggest that we become hypocritical. I do not suggest that we become a purely nominal outfit. Henry David Thoreau said something that I think is healthy to remember, among other things, when he said, "I did not come into the world to improve it, but to enjoy it." Deans have to be reminded, and collective deans have to be reminded that the enjoyment of life and the enjoyment of their work is as

important as the improvement of the human race. And yet, I must think that Henry David Thoreau was not altogether guiltless of a desire to improve the world because he stands as a model and as an inspiration to those who might take the mundane, routine administrative things of life too seriously. To be sure, he was conscious that in all that he did -- or as James Russell Lowell said, "He didn't write eight books just to show that he enjoyed living on Walden Pond."

Well, deans must improve the world in order to enjoy it. And I would say that in order to enjoy it they must improve it.

I cannot conclude without saying that I consider that I could have had no greater fortune than the good luck to have worked in that sector of education whose intrinsic worth, whatever else may be said for it, was never in question. I have had no more cherished honor than to have been associated with the men and women who compose an organization which embraces those intrinsic ideals. And I have no fonder wish than that this Association shall prosper in the fostering and in the promotion and in the making manifest in American life and American education of these ideals.

I wish you joy and profit in the present participation together in this Conference, and lifelong diligence in the service to education as one of the promises of the brotherhood of man to fulfill his noble destiny on the way, under the Fatherhood of God. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN CLEVINGER: Fred, from this response I think we have indicated to you, sir, how we feel about you and your leadership, and how we feel about what you have had to say to us here this morning. Sincerely, and from our hearts, we thank you.

I would remind you that the First Business Session is scheduled for ten-thirty in this room. Are there any further announcements? If not, we are adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at ten-five o'clock ...

## FIRST BUSINESS SESSION

Monday, April 2, 1962

The First Business Session convened at ten-thirty-five o'clock, President Fred H. Weaver presiding.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: May I ask you to take your seats. We have decided that we will start the meeting in the hope that once started others will join us.

I have a statement I would like to make pertaining to the possibility of any resolutions that anyone might care to present to the Conference. Since the last Conference, there has been considerable discussion of how we might improve the means of processing resolutions that would be submitted by members of the Association. As a result of some letters that were written and considered by the Executive Committee, Dean Carl Grip formulated what he believed would be a satisfactory procedure. We submitted that to Don DuShane, who is the James Madison of this organization, since we regard him as the constitutional father, parliamentarian, and walking interpreter and supreme court. Don, after reading this proposal, suggested that I make this statement: If there is anyone who desires to propose a resolution, he should submit the resolution in writing to the Secretary, Carl Knox, and Carl Knox will see to it that it is submitted to the proper Committee or Commission or Executive Committee. We do not have a standing Committee on Resolutions, and so we will ask you to observe this procedure if you have a resolution to present.

I really have some very important things (laughter) but I am holding up momentarily. Let me ask Carl Knox to step up here for a minute and tell us about the registration as of right now.

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: Figures from the registration desk indicate we now have 379 registrations, plus 33 wives, giving us a 412 total at the moment, and there were several registering while I was there.

We are in the check cashing -- not kiting -- business. We will be happy to accommodate you insofar as the green cash will take care of your needs. So in the course of the remaining sessions, you are welcome to stop by the registration desk and write a check if you have the need for same, and we will be happy to cash it for you. This saves the handling of depositing and transporting of direct funds; so it is a favor, possibly, to you, and it is certainly a favor to us. That is about it, Fred.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Thank you very much.

We are pleased to have as a visitor here at the session this morning the host dean to NASPA's Annual Conference

of 1937. He is now Dean Emeritus. His name is Leon Stratton with Drexel Institute. I would like Dean Stratton to stand, if he will, so that the persons here might see him. He is right back here with Bill Toombs. (Applause) We are glad you would come to our meeting, Dean Stratton, and I hope you will continue for as many of our meetings as you desire.

We will begin now with the consideration of Committee reports. Since our organization places the Vice Presidents in responsible direction of these reports, I will turn the meeting over to Juan Reid and ask that he continue to consider these reports in order, including the presiding for any motions for adoption, and discussion. Juan Reid.

... Vice President Reid assumed the Chair ...

CHAIRMAN REID: This morning, we will have three Committee reports, plus one report from a liaison officer, and the balance of the reports will be made tomorrow at the nine-thirty session.

Most of you have received this little brochure on the consulting services that have been prepared by the Committee on Consulting Services. Jack Stibbs is not here at the present time, and he has asked me to make a brief summary of this Committee's activities. I am sure that you will recall that you were circulated a form to complete early in the year regarding the information on your ability as a consultant, and this information was collected by the Committee and has been consolidated and is now found with the Committee Chairman.

As a result of this, this little brochure has been published, and this, in effect, is the report of this Committee. We now are faced with some problems in distribution -- not serious ones, of course -- to institutional heads, and to accrediting associations, and to foundations.

The Chairmanship of this Committee will be taken over by Fred Turner, which will give us more centralization, and he will have on file the names and the qualifications of all consultants who are listed with the Association. If you have any need for a consultant, please contact Fred directly.

Our next report will be given by Bob Goodridge, the liaison officer to the American Institute of Architects. Bob Goodridge.

DEAN ROBERT C. GOODRIDGE (Liaison Representative to American Institute of Architects, University of Redlands): Mr. Chairman, Officers and Members of NASPA: You should have in your hands a report of my activities during the past year. While you are looking over this report, I happened to pick up a bit of information I would like to pass along to you. As deans, and in our counseling, you know there are certain things



that we should recognize or identify. For example, a fellow who is interested in mechanics will have grease or oil under his fingernails; a boxer will have cauliflower ears; a happy motorcyclist can be identified by the bugs on his teeth.  
(Laughter)

We are most fortunate this morning to have with us a representative of the American Institute of Architects, Mr. Mario Celli, who is a member of the School and Educational Facilities Committee from AIA. In communicating with Mr. Carroll of AIA, we secured Mr. Celli, and he is here with us this morning and will be spending the day with us. Mr. Celli is from McKeesport. He is registered in the hotel. If you wish to contact him, maybe a group of interested members, we might be able to arrange a table for luncheon, or maybe a table for this evening. If you would be interested in such arrangements, if you would see me or Mr. Celli, I am sure we would be very happy to work out anything that would be convenient to you.

We are not going to read the report. It is in your hands. If you have any corrections or additions or questions concerning this report you can ask these of our Chairman.

#### ... Annual Report of Liaison Representative to The American Institute of Architects

Since our Forty-Third Annual Conference at Colorado Springs in April of last year, the Executive Committee voted to disband the Committee on Cooperation with the American Institute of Architects and appointed a liaison representative and alternate to maintain "lines of communication." I was asked to serve as liaison representative to the American Institute of Architects by our President Fred Weaver, and Dean Thomas Baker of Case Institute of Technology was selected as an alternate.

As this decision was not finalized until the Executive Committee met in Chicago on May 15, 1961, it was not possible for your representative or alternate to attend the annual meeting of the American Institute of Architects which was held in Philadelphia the last of May of that year.

Through correspondence and other forms of communication we have kept contact with AIA. These contacts were made with Mr. F. Lamar Kelsey, President of the Colorado Chapter of AIA, who was of such great help to the Committee last year at Colorado Springs; Mr. William H. Scheick, Executive Director of AIA; and Mr. M. Elliott Carroll, Head of the Chapter and Student Affairs of AIA. Mr. Carroll extended an invitation to members of NASPA to meet with AIA in Dallas, Texas, at their national convention, May 7 through 11. They will be considering urban design from the point of view of the professional architect.

The American Institute of Architects have sent Mr.

Mario C. Celli as their representative to the conference. Mr. Celli is a member of the AIA School and Educational Facilities Committee. We are most fortunate to have him with us and trust his being here will benefit both organizations.

Mr. Eric Pawley, Research Secretary of the American Institute of Architects, I believe, would be anxious and willing to cooperate with NASPA or any individual member in developing a research project that would be beneficial to both organizations. The report of the Committee on Cooperation with the American Institute of Architects at our Colorado Springs Conference last year mentioned several projects in which NASPA cooperated with AIA. At the present time we are not involved in any joint undertaking. It is felt that there would be mutual benefit if we would share our philosophy and problems of student housing, college unions, and other educational buildings, so the architects may furnish us with the best possible plans in constructing our much needed facilities, many of which have been erected in haste, with little thought as to provision for the group and the individual lives of the occupants.

I would be remiss not to mention the recent report from Educational Facilities Laboratories College Students Live Here by Dr. Harold C. Riker and Frank G. Lopez. Copies are available from Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 447 Madison Avenue, New York 22. This long awaited publication is a fine contribution to the housing area. The book exhibit includes a copy of this publication.

Your attention is directed to an annotated bibliography, July 1956 to December 1960, entitled Student Housing in Colleges and Universities, and published by Western Personnel Institute. This publication was recognized in the current issue of College and University Business. Forms for ordering may be obtained at the book exhibit, where a copy is displayed.

Acknowledgments are due to our Executive Committee and other members of NASPA who were responsible for providing the display of model buildings, the book exhibit, and for arranging Wednesday afternoon's tour of educational facilities in the Philadelphia area. ...

Mr. Chairman, I move that the report be accepted as given on the printed material.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN REID: It has been moved and seconded that the report of our Liaison Representative to the American Institute of Architects be accepted and become a part of the record. Is there any discussion or any questions at this time of Bob Goodridge regarding his functions as Liaison Officer, or this report? If not, we will entertain the motion. All in favor signify by saying "aye"; opposed. The motion is carried.

DEAN GOODRIDGE: Could I introduce Mr. Celli to you at this time. Mr. Celli, would you please stand. (Applause) Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REID: The next Committee report will be given by Dick Hansford from Akron, on Fraternity Relations. Dick Hansford.

DIRECTOR RICHARD L. HANSFORD (University of Akron, Committee on Fraternity Relations): The Fraternity Relations Committee for 1960-61 considered several projects suggested by members of NASPA and others, the development of which would be of value to institutions of higher education and to national fraternities. The Committee selected for development two of the projects for which there appeared to be the greatest need and interest.

The first of the two projects provided for the creation and implementation of a training program for Advisers of Undergraduate Interfraternity Councils of the member institutions of NASPA. The proposed program called for a one day seminar to be held immediately prior to, during, or immediately following the 1962 Annual Meeting of NASPA. An outline of the areas to be covered during the seminar period and a recommendation of the personnel who would conduct the program appears in last year's report of this Committee.

The approach to the project by this year's Committee is a seminar session which is scheduled for tomorrow afternoon. The title of the session is: "Needed: A Working National Conference of the Undergraduate Inter-Fraternity Council Leaders." The speakers will include members of the National Interfraternity Conference Executive Committee and members of the NASPA Fraternity Relations Committee.

The second project recommended by last year's Committee, and one in which the National Interfraternity Conference and the Executive Committee of NASPA has expressed considerable interest, has two phases. The first part to be the construction of a questionnaire, the use of which will identify degree-granting institutions which desire additional chapters of national fraternities, institutions without chapters of national fraternities which desire to establish national fraternity chapters on their campuses, and national fraternities which desire to place chapters at degree-granting institutions of higher education.

The second phase of the project is the development of procedures to be followed by colleges and universities and national fraternities when seeking to establish new chapters of national fraternities.

Last year's Committee report stated that the Executive Committees of NASPA and NIC had approved the project, that the NIC had approved an appropriation of monies to defray most of the cost of the project, that Purdue University had volunteered

its facilities for the preparation and mailing of the questionnaire, and that a subcommittee, whose membership would be drawn from NIC and NASPA, with O. D. Roberts, Purdue University, to serve as Chairman, would be formed to develop the questionnaire.

Dean Roberts has informed me that the subcommittee has completed the questionnaire directed to colleges and universities, that the distribution has been made and that an 86% return has been realized. The questionnaire regarding which national fraternities desire to place additional chapters on college and university campuses, and the second phase of the project, the procedures to be followed for establishment of new chapters, should be completed during the next year.

The Committee should like to express its appreciation to the NIC for making the project possible.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes the report of the Fraternity Relations Committee. I move for the adoption of the report.

CHAIRMAN REID: Is there a second to the motion?

DEAN DUSHANE: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN REID: Is there any discussion on this report of the project, or questions you would like to ask Dick while he is up here? If not, we will move for the adoption of the report. All in favor signify by saying, "aye"; opposed. The report is adopted and it becomes a part of the proceedings.

Now the next Committee, the Committee on Membership, will make their report tomorrow morning, but Jim McLeod would like to make an announcement at this time, the Committee Chairman.

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD (Northwestern University, Chairman, Committee on Membership): Thank you, Juan. I would like to announce that the Committee on Membership will meet this afternoon at four o'clock in the Foyer, a room right outside and to the right of the entrance to this room where we are now meeting. I would also like to invite those representatives of institutions which are not now presently members of NASPA at four-thirty. This meeting will be brief, but will present to you an opportunity to find out the procedures for admission to membership in NASPA.

Very quickly, I would like to read the names of those institutions which have made inquiry, are likely to attend, but whose membership has not been completed. Lest you doubt whether or not you should come to this meeting, I will read the names of these institutions, and if the representatives of any of these institutions are here, they should come.

Ashland College  
Bloomsburg State College  
Boston College  
Franklin and Marshall  
Gonzaga University  
Hampton Institute  
Hamline University  
Illinois College  
Lincoln College  
Little Rock College

Lock Haven State College  
Michigan State-Oakland  
Millikan University  
Monmouth College  
Northern Michigan  
Northwest Missouri State  
Potomac State College of  
West Virginia Univ.  
Sonoma State College  
Tabor College  
Wesleyan University

I would hope that all of those people will be present and representatives of any other institutions not presently members but interested in becoming such.

I call again to your attention this little brochure, and I would urge again the members of the Membership Committee to bear in mind that those with the green ribbons and those who are representing institutions not members would like to meet you, and I am sure you would like to meet them. Thank you very much, Juan.

CHAIRMAN REID: Last year we missed one of our Past Presidents of NASPA who was absent due to the death of a very close friend of many of the members of this Association, and this year he is back with us; one of the hardest working members, by the way, of this organization, and one of our Committee Chairmen. I think that no meeting of NASPA is complete without some kind of a report from "Shorty" Nowotny. So at this time we will have a report from Dean Arno Nowotny on the Committee on Placement.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Tell him to stand up. (Laughter)

DEAN ARNO "SHORTY" NOWOTNY (University of Texas, Chairman, Committee on Placement): This is like a spittoon (referring to microphone); it ain't no good unless you hit it right. (Laughter)

If you look at your program, if you have one, on page 19 there is a committee appointed by President Weaver, the Committee on Placement and we have this brief report to make. I feel sort of like the man who went into the restaurant and said, "I'd like to have two fried eggs and some kind words." The waitress brought in the eggs, and he said, "Where are the kind words?" She said, "Don't eat them eggs." (Laughter)

This Placement Committee, seven members, met Saturday afternoon from two till six, discussing how we could make this more meaningful to young men who are looking for a job, and also to employers, some of you old men who are looking for assistants, or deans of men, or deans of students. The Chairman of the Committee made a report to the Executive Committee Saturday morning. There were enough copies for everybody on

the Committee but not for everybody in this audience. We were a little short of cash and we didn't have that much money. This Committee is the only one, Fred, that doesn't cost any money. It is self-operating. We charge a fee of \$5.00 for anybody who writes in between Conventions, and we get about \$250 to \$300 from 50 or 60 suckers who send in those five dollars. (Laughter) That pays for cutting stencils, postage, and a little clerical assistance to operate out of the Chairman's office.

Then we have at this Convention, in the Independence Room down the hall, right near where you registered, the headquarters room for placement. There have been about 40 or 50 young men who have registered at this Convention without cost. They are here and available to you who are employers.

In addition, there is a list of people, of names at the main desk; one group who have masters' degrees, and another group who have bachelors' degrees, and another group who have doctors' degrees.

We're just a bunch of country boys trying to get along, and we do the best to try to help these boys with green ribbons who want a better job, or people who are here for the first time. So if you have not been in that room down the hall, you will find these seven members of this Committee all here and they are keeping that office open from nine to five every day, and last night they were open even during the banquet hour. They are a group of people who are very interested in helping these folks. So if you have a job that you want to list, we will be happy to serve you.

This is our annual report. We have \$40.05 left in the treasury. Anybody need any money, come to see us. (Laughter)

#### ... Summary of Financial Records

April 1, 1961 through March 31, 1962

April 1, 1961	Balance on hand .....	\$ 5.05
	<u>Receipts</u>	
	Dues	\$260.00
	Total Receipts .....	<u>260.00</u>
	Total Receipts and Balance .....	265.05
	<u>Disbursements</u>	
	Supplies and	
	Clerical Assis-	
	tance	<u>225.00</u>
	Total Disbursements .....	<u>225.00</u>
March 31, 1962	Closing balance .....	\$ 40.05 ...

I move adoption of this report, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REID: Is there a second to "Shorty's" motion?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN REID: It has been moved and seconded we accept the report of the Committee on Placement. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion please signify by saying "aye"; opposed. The motion is carried.

We have Mr. Celli of the AIA who has offered to describe to any of you who might be interested in their Committee on School and Educational Facilities -- where is he now, Bob? He's right there. I would like to point out to you, if any of you are really interested in this, would you please contact him immediately after this meeting because it won't take him too long, three to five minutes, to give you a good description.

At this time, I would like to turn the meeting over to Hal Stewart, Vice President in charge of the Commission set-up.

... Vice President Harold E. Stewart assumed the Chair ...

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Thank you, Juan. My wife told me a story the other day that I think is relatively applicable, an incident that happened at a neighborhood grocery store. A housewife who had just moved into the neighborhood came into the store and she said to the proprietor, "Sir, are your eggs especially fresh?" The proprietor turned to his clerk and said, "Bill, go back there and feel those eggs and see if they are cool enough to sell." (Laughter) I'll start that one over again. That is one I laid. (Laughter) The reason I thought it was apropos is that I am sure that these reports you heard this morning are strictly fresh. Whether they are cool enough to sell, I am not to be the judge, you are.

The first report is the report of Commission I on Professional Relations, Dean Jack Clevenger.

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE CLEVINGER (Washington State University, Chairman, Commission I): Hal, I didn't get the full import of this introduction. We had a little rump session going over here on the side. I will have to find out later if I have to make some reply to your introduction.

A year ago at Colorado Springs, Commission I reported that its primary activity had been concerned with the development of the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee and presented some recommendations to you regarding this organization. The Commission also proposed certain internal structural changes for NASPA relations with other associations and organizations.

You approved these recommendations and we are pleased to report that most of them have been implemented. Among other things, we agreed to add the Association of College and University Housing Officers, and the Association of College Unions to this inter-Association group.

Since many of you know some of these men, I would report that representing the Housing Association at the Committee meetings in Chicago will be Newell J. Smith, University of Wisconsin, who is President now of ACUHO; Malcolm G. Gray, Mississippi State University, First Vice President of ACUHO; Frank C. Sheil, University of Michigan, Second Vice President of ACUHO; and Fred A. Schwendiman, Brigham Young University, Past President of ACUHO.

The following Union Directors will represent the Association of College Unions at the Chicago meeting: Stanton R. Curtis, Boston University; Max H. Andrews of New York University; Floyd I. Brewer, University of Cincinnati; William E. Rion, University of Florida; George L. Donovan, Pennsylvania State University; and Alfred L. Ellingson, University of Oregon.

Under the sponsorship of Commission I, the "Yearbook," or more appropriately the "Directory," of Student Personnel and Related Organizations in Colleges and Universities" has been published and distributed to our NASPA membership, and to the organizations listed in this directory. I believe all of you, during the last two months, have received a copy of this from Carl Knox. Our Commission wants particularly to make it clear at this time that this was an Ohio State effort all the way, and that we are indebted to Deans Bill Guthrie and Ken Vanderbush who are the men who actually did all the work on this little publication.

Among other things, last year you approved and the Executive Committee has since implemented our recommendation that certain NASPA "Liaison Committees" be replaced by "Liaison Representatives." The Executive Committee in the coming year will need to evaluate this new plan after it has had sufficient time to prove its practicability.

Our Commission would like to offer the following observations and recommendations as we look to the future of our work and responsibilities.

First of all, as to the Yearbook. During the coming year Commission I proposes to evaluate carefully the usefulness of this publication and changes needed if it is to be continued. If the evaluation does substantiate its usefulness, then our Commission will need to give consideration to establishing a charge for it so its continued publication can become self-supporting.

Incidentally, in response to Carl's invitation for comments, actually a rather large number of people have written



to the Chairman of Commission I, reporting as individuals in this organization, and reporting for other organizations listed in the directory, and I am pleased to report that all of these comments are quite favorable to the publication, and these people have all urged its continuation. So far, there have been no negative reports, and I am a little surprised at this.

On the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee we have some problems. This Committee was organized originally under the thesis that the contributions of Student Personnel work to Higher Education could be enhanced by an organization composed of leaders of student personnel organizations meeting to share ideas and to attempt to coordinate common concerns and functions.

This Committee has now been meeting for four years, and as I see it, its productivity has been limited by certain fairly obvious inherent problems. First of all, it has been handicapped by lack of continuity in membership caused by a "turn-over" in officer personnel of the associations represented; second, lack of funds, operative funds. Third, there has been a lack of follow-up. Fourth, there has been a problem created through the scheduling of the meeting of the Committee during the APGA Convention and thus the attendant problems of all the hub-bub and confusion and competing interests and responsibilities of the individual Committee members; and I think this applies particularly to the ACPA people who were having their Convention at this same time; and then finally -- and I think this is the most important problem that is before this Inter-Association group -- at least my suspicion that the founding fathers of the Committee were inclined to be overly ambitious about program and potential for the organization -- at least for the early stages of the organization.

The Committee chairmanship of this group rotates year by year. A year ago it was the Association of Registrars and Admissions Officers. This past year it has been ACPA's year to chair this group. This was done by Dean Kathryn L. Hopwood of Hunter College. In preparing for the meetings of the Inter-Association group in Chicago, in two weeks, she has asked for consideration of some problems, including the problem of what changes in structure, scope and methods of the Inter-Association Committee should be considered. The very practical question of what, realistically, can we do? And how? The question of have we milked dry the present committee assignments? And we may have. Should some of our present working committees be dissolved? Do we need some "new blood"? And, most important of all, where do we go from here? This is a very good question because this coming year is NASPA's year to chair this Inter-Association group, and I think we have some pretty important problems before it.

We started bravely. The ideas behind this were good and were sound. We have some problems before us and where and

how we proceed from this point is going to be, partially at least, a responsibility of NASPA leadership in the coming year.

Relationships with State and Regional groups of Student Personnel Administrators. Commission I proposes in the coming year to make a study of the numbers and types of "deans'" associations existing in this country and then present our view of the desired relationship of NASPA to these groups. As examples, we have the Allerton Conference, The Pacific Coast Dean's group that has been meeting annually for the past several years, the Virginia Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the Ohio Association, and many others.

I think we ought to try to determine what our relationship should be to these groups, and this we propose to do.

Then we move on to NASPA and its inter-action with those educational associations dealing with broad educational policies and programs (such as ACE and NEA) and those more specifically concerned with the administration of higher education (such as Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, Association of American Colleges, and Association of American Universities.)

It is the feeling of our Commission that for many years both the Commission and the Association as a whole have had some problems in the attempts to develop an appropriate relationship between NASPA and those associations and organizations that are potent and influential in the development of the nation's educational program.

I think a good example of our problem here is in the case of Congressional Committee hearings on the development of the NDEA and the NDSL programs. Our organization is composed of men responsible for the development and operation of student financial aids programs at the campus level, yet their testimony is not sought when expert opinion is presented regarding loan and scholarship programs. Rather, representatives of educational associations other than ours appear before such hearings.

Fred mentioned the American Council on Education, and some possibilities for us as we look ahead in the future, in his address this morning. In many ways, the American Council on Education, at least appears to be the organization most commonly invited to offer testimony involving problems of the educational concerns of the Congress. An effective relationship between NASPA and the ACE should result in an opportunity for our organization to make its influence known through the contributions our members could make.

Commission I suggests again that the Executive Committee give consideration to sending official representatives

of NASPA to the annual meetings of ACE, the Land Grant Association, and so on, and also to invite representatives of these associations to our annual meeting.

Commission I will continue its deliberations on this problem. We suggest, however, that this particular problem cannot be completely resolved until our Association determines for itself its own appropriate role in the current educational scene.

Fred mentioned the Committee "on the Future" this morning. I want to assure you that the Executive Committee, for the coming year, will carry on discussions, with the help and advice of all of you, about the proper role and function of NASPA. We feel that a more clearly defined educational role for NASPA, as a part of the national scene, will help those associations that I have indicated earlier better understand our potential for service to the nation's program of higher education.

I want to say too how fortunate we are to have Don Winbigler reassume the chairmanship of Commission I. You will recall that prior to his presidency of this organization, Don served as Chairman of Commission I. He has some interest here. He has the know-how. There are some things in the wind that are going to be pretty important, and this is going to continue to be one of our primary areas of concern, and we had a discussion last night, amongst some of the Executive Committee group, about personnel for this Commission.

Don, you have asked for a meeting again at four o'clock tomorrow afternoon -- is Don here? -- is that right?

DEAN WINBIGLER: In the Lafayette Room.

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE CLEVINGER: In the Lafayette Room. Hal, the members of our Commission are listed in your program. I move that this report be accepted.

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Is there a second?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Any questions you wish to ask Jack about the report or the work of the Commission? If not, all in favor of accepting the report say "aye"; opposed. The report is adopted.

Commission II does not have any formal report to present to the Conference this year, but it has cooperated with the Conference planners in setting up a session which is directly in line with one of its major concerns, and I would like to call your attention at this time to that session. This is at ten-thirty tomorrow morning. The speaker will be Clark Byse, Professor of Administrative Law, Harvard University School of Law; Legal Counsel, American Association of

University Professors, speaking to the topic "Procedure in Student Discipline." After his talk, there will be discussion by a panel for resource and reaction. I am sure that this is one topic in which we all have a prime interest.

Commission III, Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators. The report will be given by its Chairman, Bob Shaffer.

DEAN ROBERT SHAFFER (Indiana University, Chairman, Commission III): Mr. Chairman, Commission III, the Commission concerned with the Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators, has had three main projects. I might add that the membership of the Commission are listed on page 21 of your program.

First, during the year, two members of the Commission, Dean Jimmy Allen, of Texas Tech, and Bill Brown, formerly of Illinois Institute of Technology, and now at Purdue, completed a brochure on College Student Personnel Work as a Career. O. D. Roberts, as the previous Chairman of Commission III, sort of master-minded the idea. That brochure will be out in the next two months. I hope that all of you working with your student leaders on your campuses will see fit to place this brochure in the hands of those students who might be encouraged, and should be encouraged, to pursue this field as a career.

Second, an area of work for the coming year particularly, will be the development of a proposed staff seminar program, including suggested topics and resource material, to stimulate more effective in-service training programs. We hope these include the development and try out of specific topics and local staffs by Commission members, and then dissemination of these topics to the entire membership. Parenthetically, I might remind those of you who are staff directors, that this would be a way for some of us to be educated, for a change, by the well-informed, competent, young men on our staffs.

The third area of concern: We are going to attempt to fashion a statement of the student personnel administrator's job, both as a basis for a proposed training effort, and also as an effort to overcome the image of the student personnel administrator as a person primarily interested in drinking and sex. (Laughter)

The fourth area of concern would be a statement of principles and suggested procedures for an academically sound and professionally practical internship for practicum programs. We would hope that the subcommittee of this Commission can come up with a statement that would stimulate and facilitate formal arrangements between student personnel divisions and various institutions, particularly of all sizes and types, with training institutions so we can actually get our internship program on the road.

Members of the Commission and, maybe, I feel that the training and development of staff members are among the most important functions of the student personnel administrator today, and certainly an important area of concern for this Association; therefore, we invite anyone interested in working on these and related projects to talk with Dean Jack Gwin who will be the Vice President in charge of Commissions for this coming year, or with me as Chairman of Commission III. No honor, not too much work, and maybe some value out of it; so I invite your participation.

Then, lastly, I would like to call to your attention a program tonight of the seminar series, Seminar III, page 9, which is concerned with "The Training and Selection of Student Personnel Administrators" -- a good panel, including Professor Gordon Klopff, one of our former active members, who is one of the speakers here.

I do not know if this needs formal action but, Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this report.

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Is there a second?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Any questions you would like to address to Bob? If not, the motion is to adopt the report. All those in favor say "aye"; opposed. The report is adopted.

The reports of Commissions IV, V, VI, and VII will be heard at the Business Sessions, either Tuesday or possibly Wednesday.

Commission VIII, "The Student and Social Issues;" Ed Williamson will give a progress report of that Commission at this time. Ed.

DEAN E. G. WILLIAMSON (University of Minnesota, Chairman, Commission VIII): Mr. Vice President, Ladies and Gentlemen: Commission VIII was appointed a little more than a year ago and made its first formulation report at the Colorado Springs session. Since then the Commission has been engaged, through the mail, and through one meeting preceding the meeting of the Executive Committee, in refining of its proposed national study, and in the critical review of the phrasing of the proposal itself. We are having mimeographed the latest revision of this statement of the proposed study, somewhat in detail, which will be available to you for your own critical examination.

But in case you cannot wait for the mimeographer, my secretary has kindly airmailed to me some copies, and I would be glad to distribute them so I won't have to pay return postage. (Laughter) I have about 12 or 15 of them here, if you would care to read them. We would be very glad to have you examine them critically, and I would prefer that you write me

your reactions so that I may distribute it to all members of the Commission for a very critical re-examination of our proposal, and any of the like that you may have.

We would like to keep in communication with the members of the Association so that we may get the best of the thinking of everyone.

As you know, this is a very complex problem which many people have readily solved with a formula. There are, of course, so many variations from campus to campus, and region to region, that it is very difficult to accept one individual's experience as generalizable to everyone.

I may say that as you read our statement, you will see that we are not seeking for a formula answer that will fit every situation and every campus. Rather is the Commission engaged in a totally different kind of study. We hope to develop an accurate description of current practices and policies and attitudes, both from students on local campuses and from the administration and faculty, in addition to the deans themselves. These four agents on each campus have slightly different perspectives, no doubt, and certainly they have different experience backgrounds; and it is the feeling of our Commission that until we get a true, comprehensive, accurate picture or description of the current thinking and current practice that any formulation, any recommendation, any guiding principles will not be based upon the best thinking and the best experience.

So what we propose to do, in brief, is to secure a foundation grant of considerable size, to employ a technically competent staff, and to make a questionnaire study of a representative sampling of, say, 800 to 1,000 institutions, geographically distributed, and also distributed by type of institution, as to the present practices and policies governing the organized expressions of groups of students and individual students with respect to controversial social, societal issues.

You can see this is a study of great magnitude. It is the kind of a study that, as far as we know, has never been made, and certainly it ought to be made if our thinking is to gather up the best of experience universally.

We propose also to make a second investigation in considerable depth. I should say that the questionnaire study will survey in considerable detail the thinking and practices and policies of the presidents, of deans of students and their staffs, of student editors, of student government presidents, and also of the faculty chairmen of whatever committee is in charge of this aspect of student life.

In like manner, we will survey by personal interview on a selected sampling of institutions, geographically distributed, and also by type, say of fifty institutions, by personal interview we will again try to get any items of

experience that would be relevant to our understanding of what goes on today.

Then we will hope, if we get the money, to employ technically competent consultants who will prepare exhaustive studies of the philosophic, historical, and legal aspects of this problem of freedom of expression on controversial issues.

There has been a good deal of speaking and writing on the legal aspects, but there has been almost no discussion in depth of the philosophic aspects and important considerations with regard to freedom of thought and freedom of expression on the part of students, both individual and organized. There is a good deal of dogmatic opinion and you can quote almost any authority with regard to any point of view, from those who think that students should be there to go to class and let the faculty do the thinking, or the president do the speaking, to the other extreme that there should be no restraint whatsoever on students because they are citizens in a democracy, and we fought King George in order to get freedom of thought, and that there is no problem.

Either one of these extremes may be true, but there are a good many people who would not agree with it, so there is a freedom to disagree apparently with agreement, which introduces some very interesting philosophical complications.

Likewise, there has been almost no literature that I can find on the historical story with regard to students' freedom of expression. And as I read the history, this has had a very interesting and somewhat unsavory history, and we think that our thinking, as deans of students, will be much clearer and much more constructive if we understand the historical background.

So we propose, if we get the money, to employ some competent historian to tell the story.

Out of all these data we hope will come the kind of basic, relevant information which will permit the Commission, in the first instance, to begin to draw the picture together and to identify guidelines which may help you and me to live under this daily bombardment from students and faculty, and every other public in the state and community, to define freedom and its limitations -- especially the limitations.

We hope we will also have the kind of authoritative, scholarly information which will gain the respect and confidence of members of the faculty who make educational policy which we administer; and that we shall also gain the confidence and, therefore, the authority that is necessary if the students are to accept us as playing more than the role of saying, "No, you can't do that."

Unfortunately, at the present time, we have seen exhibited the kind of "beat hell out of the deans" movement,

to win freedom from the administration, especially the dean of students. In contrast with this kind of a militant advocacy of the "no limitation on freedom," we hope that we will lay the foundation for the kind of a scholarly seminar approach which ought to be characteristic of our discussion in higher education of this kind of a complicated situation so important in the achieving of the institutional mission.

It is a very, very sad commentary, from my point of view, that with regard to the basic controversial issue of freedom of expression we apply non-rational methods to find a solution. Surely, if higher education has any unity whatsoever, we can apply to this controversial issue the scholarly, thoughtful, rational approach to find a working solution, as contrasted with the non-rational advocacy of some particular point of view.

Providing we are able to digest and master the data we have collected, we hope then to present to you both the basic data of all the kinds I have spoken about, together with our tentative interpretations, and with some suggestions and recommendations as to guiding principles. We hope that this will pass through the Executive Committee, that these summarizations will pass in review before you, so that you will have plenty of time between annual meetings to make your own critical appraisal of the data and of our interpretations and the implications of these data.

Following this kind of foundational preparation, we hope that we can organize at some annual meeting, after we have had plenty of time to think about the implications of the data, a series of meetings which will further give thoughtful considerations to the implications for you in your daily operations.

As I say, this is a long range project which we have deliberately planned, which will be delayed so that there can be plenty of time for data collecting, and for interpretation, and for critical review. Whatever happens to the report from there on is, of course, a matter for you and for your Executive Committee to give consideration to.

Let me say that as far as I sense the sentiment and intentions of the Committee, we are not looking for the kind of official procedures which everyone should follow. Diversity is, of course, characteristic of American higher education, and we do not intend to, in any way, bring forth anything which would serve as a limitation on the exercise of your own institutional and personal action. This Association has no authority, and we do not intend to try to do anything more than to present the best thinking that is possible for us, for your critical examination and with respect to the implications for you and your own campus.

Let me repeat again: I have copies of the final revision of the statement, and if you would care to use them,



I would be very glad to give them to you.

I think I move the adoption of the report.

... Commission VIII's revised statement titled "A Proposed Study of Students' Discussion and Action on Social Issues" was submitted as follows:

PURPOSE:

We propose a national study to identify and to place in historical and philosophical context the current policies and practices of institutions of higher learning regarding student expression, by word and act, about controversial issues both on and off campus; and on the basis of this study to formulate for the consideration of the member institutions principles bearing on student expression consistent with and supportive of the institutions' individually defined educational mission.

THE NEED FOR THIS STUDY:

We Americans are continually experiencing an intense awareness of our social and political problems. In line with our traditions there are many acceptable modes of expressing convictions: public discussion, petition, demonstration, participation in public rallies, and other forms of social action. Students' interests in social problems are no less intense than those of other citizens, and students employ methods of expression similar to those observed in non-academic communities.

Each year in American colleges there are riots and demonstrations, sometimes violent and sometimes associated with restrictions on freedom of action and expression of convictions. In recent years, peaceful variations have become more prevalent.

Student personnel administrators, especially, are at the very center of controversy about the rights of students to discuss and express opinions, to demonstrate, to petition, and to take sides on local, national, and international issues. It is the student personnel administrator who is expected by the administration at large to maintain an orderly and non-disrupted student life. It is he who is criticized when he attempts to restrict, modulate, and modify what students insist is an "inalienable" right to behavior. Incidentally, there is seldom any acknowledgment of students' responsibilities to help achieve the educational mission of the college through learning the art of reasoned dissent and thoughtful examination of controversial issues.

Educating the students to these responsibilities should constitute one of the goals of the student personnel administrator. Current demonstrations by students to express their points of view, convictions, and desired solutions of contemporary societal issues are but the latest exercise of what students

asserted to be the rights of citizenship in our democracy. (A thoughtful analysis of these demonstrations and the supporting assertions of student rights will reveal many unanswered questions that deserve rational examination.) There is a great deal of confusion and ambiguity in the minds of students, administrators, and the many publics about legal issues and institutional policies, which touch on the rights of students to express themselves as they choose on controversial social issues.

#### BASIC QUESTIONS NEEDING STUDY:

Among many unanswered questions needing careful study are these:

1. If we assume the rights of citizens to demonstrate lawfully and peaceably in favor of their convictions and desired changes in policies and practices, are there any proper restrictions or modifications (i.e., limits) of students' rights as citizens inherent in the students' status as members of the collegiate institution?
2. Does a collegiate institution possess a legal right to establish regulations and standards of behavior which, in effect, "modify" rights of individual students and groups of students as citizens in the larger community? What is the proper role of students in determining an answer to this question?
3. If the answer to number two is yes, then what are the proper procedures to be used by institutions in establishing particular regulations? What is the proper role of students in the establishment of such regulations?
4. If the answer to number two is no, then what procedures may be followed by the institution in establishing or confirming such a right?
5. What restrictions concerning demonstrations and discussion of controversial issues or policies may properly be established in colleges in view of any especial educational commitment?
6. What regulations may institutions properly establish concerning the use of campus facilities by students in demonstrating and publicly expressing their viewpoints?
7. Do students, individually and in groups, have the "right" to discuss topics and issues of their choice? Do they have the "right" to invite speakers of their choice on any topic? Does the collegiate institution have authority to establish regulations and limits in the exercise of such "rights?" If the answer is yes to any of the above three questions, then how shall such regulations and rights be established and enforced?

There are many other aspects of the basic question as to the rights of students, as well as to the authority of the institution and students' responsibilities to the college. The above questions and areas of conflict and confusion illustrate the need for an authoritative and dispassionate study of the entire matter.

#### AREAS OF CONFLICT AND CONFUSION:

Each of the following areas of conflict and confusion is to be studied by both questionnaire and interview in order to determine not only informal and written policies in the various colleges and universities, but also as to practices in enforcing existing policies.

Enacted "rights" re. such behavior as the following (excluding disciplinary individual misbehavior of a moral or academic character):

1. Demonstrations, e.g. sit-in or picketing.
2. Invitations to speakers of students' choice to the campus.
3. Expression of viewpoint by means of telegrams or petitions to government agencies and officials.
4. Advocacy of action by public officials and others.
5. The student press: freedom of editorial comment and selection of news content; selection of editor-in-chief; administrative "control" through financial support.
6. Political advocacy on the campus (in the status of student) in local, state, and national elections.
7. The right of privacy in student status concerning controversial issues and "beliefs": the use of "privileged" information by teachers and administrators in communication with possible employers and government agencies; the use of membership lists of student organizations.
8. The right to "due process" of "trial" concerning the expression of viewpoints on controversial issues or the alleged violation of regulations governing students in their expression of viewpoints.
9. The "right" to organize a student group to advocate a viewpoint using established modes of advocacy.
10. The right of student government to take a stand on controversial issues.
11. The college's "right" to deny admission and continued enrollment of students except upon agreement that they will avoid specified forms of expression of opinion on controversial issues.

#### DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

The study hereby proposed can be divided into three steps:

1. A careful determination of current policies, administrative procedures, and students' practices and activities

will be made in a sampling (approximately 1,000) of varied types of colleges and universities widely distributed geographically. An extensive questionnaire directed to administrators (presidents and deans of students), to faculty policy committees and to students (student government and student editors) supplemented by intensive interviews of administrators (presidents and deans of students), faculty policy committees, and students (student government and student editors) within a smaller, but representative sampling of (fifty) institutions.

2. Intensive and authoritative studies made by competent consultants of the legal, philosophical and historical aspects of both the institutions' authority over students' expression and demonstrations and also the rights and responsibilities of students.

3. Using the data from these studies indicated above, the Commission, in conferences with consultants (including students), will define the current problems, recommend guidelines for establishing proper institutional policies and student practices. Such recommendations will not be binding upon institutions or students but will rather serve as stimulants to thoughtful review of current practices and policies.

The documents of the several studies and the final formulation of recommendations will be reported to the Executive Committee of NASPA and to the Association in its annual meeting for action, followed by consultation with officers of national professional and collegiate personnel associations and national student associations with a view to soliciting their evaluation and support.

Subsequently, the Association will issue the studies and the final report in bulletin form to collegiate institutions for the consideration of officials, faculties, faculty committees in charge of student affairs, and student leaders; in addition, copies will be issued to officers of national collegiate student personnel associations and to national student associations.

PROPOSED BUDGET  
NASPA COMMISSION VIII

DIRECTOR: Chairman of Commission VIII

PROJECT: National Study of the Student and Social Action

PERSONAL SERVICES

Technical Director (12 mos. @ \$10,000/year)	\$10,000.00
Clerk-Typist (12 mos. @ \$2,772/year)	2,772.00 <sup>(1)</sup>
Half-time Graduate Asst. (12 mos. @ \$2,820/yr.)	2,820.00 <sup>(2)</sup>
Misc. Statistical & Clerical Assistance	2,000.00
SUB TOTAL	** \$17,592.00

### TRAVEL

4 Committee meetings @ aver. \$1,000.00/meeting \$4,000.00

Fees for consultants re. research design;  
questionnaire and interview schedule; legal,  
philosophical (educational) and historical  
background of the issues and problems of  
students and social action. 6,000.00

Consultant travel to 2 meetings @ \$450/meeting 900.00

Travel for interviewing (43 trips @ \$175/trip) 9,275.00

SUB TOTAL \*\* \$20,175.00

### POSTAGE, TELEPHONE, TELEGRAPH

Aver. \$90/mo. for 12 mos. 1,080.00

### PRINTING AND RELATED EXPENSES

Publication of report (4,000 copies)(3)  
Manufacturing Costs \$3,500.00  
Editing & Production Costs 1,400.00  
Miscellaneous Expense 100.00 5,000.00

Miscellaneous Printing 200.00

SUB TOTAL \*\* 5,200.00

### COLLEGE SERVICES

Mimeographing 500.00  
Services 150.00

SUB TOTAL \*\* 650.00

### CONTRACTUAL SERVICES

Coding Data and Tabulating 500.00  
NASPA Budget Financial & Book-  
keeping Services 500.00  
Letterheads & Envelopes  
3,000 of ea. @ \$21.85 for 1st  
1,000 & \$12.95 ea. add'l 1,000 50.00  
Second Sheets, Bond & onion-  
skin-- 6 reams of ea. @ \$.39/  
ream for second sheets, \$1.06/  
ream for onionskin & \$1.62/  
ream for bond 20.00  
Ditto Master Units @ \$2.35/box  
of 100 (5 boxes) 12.00  
Ditto Paper (20 lb.)-50 reams  
at \$.77/ream 40.00

SUB TOTAL \$ 1,122.00

### GENERAL SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

Office Supplies \$ 500.00

### EQUIPMENT AND RENTAL

Office Equipment 931.00

Office Space Rental 600.00

SUB TOTAL 1,531.00

### PUBLIC RELATIONSHIP DISTRIBUTION

e. g., Copy to each president of 1,800 colleges with covering letters, copies to educational and personnel magazines and presidents of educational personnel associations, etc. 1,000.00

TECHNICAL SUPPLIES, BOOKS, AND PUBLICATIONS 150.00

CONTINGENCY FUND 1,000.00

GRAND TOTAL \*\*\*\*\* \$ 50,000.00

1. Using University of Minnesota Civil Service salary rate.
2. Using University of Minnesota base academic salary rate.
3. Based on rough estimate supplied by the University of Minnesota Press.
4. Includes printing costs and stock used.

### SUPERVISORY STRUCTURE:

The study will be conducted by a technical staff under the direction of the Chairman of Commission VIII. The Commission will serve continuously in an advisory capacity and will review the completed report and make recommendations to the Association concerning action and distribution of that report. Technical consultants will be employed to assist with statistical analyses of data and with the formulation of philosophical, legal, and historical delineation of issues, institutional authority, and students' rights and responsibilities as well as recommended policies and procedures for consideration by institutions.

### SOME ANTICIPATED EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS ACCRUING FROM THIS STUDY:

1. The study should profitably delineate the present true status of students' rights and responsibilities within the college to replace the present confusion as to the legal status of students' rights to express viewpoints.
2. The study should identify differences in procedures and policies (regulations) among different types of colleges and among colleges in different locations or regions.

3. The study should highlight students' responsibilities in achieving the mission of college -- an orderly and thoughtful effort to understand the phenomenon of controversy over rights of expression of convictions.

4. Students would be presented with a positive alternative to the violence and unproductive conflict which too frequently characterizes the exercise of their right of expression of viewpoints.

5. Deans of students would learn new and more productive procedures in assisting students to search for fruitful ways of expressing their viewpoints.

6. The report would strengthen the public's conception of the college as an institution dedicated to thoughtful examination of issues that are controversial rather than as an arena of violent conflict of irrational forces.

7. Deans of students and other college administrators would learn the college's intellectual mission of rational understanding of societal forces and political issues that divide our citizens into "warring" forces which communicate only rarely in a fruitful dialogue.

The Commission VIII is composed of the following members:

Dean E. G. Williamson, Chairman, University of Minnesota  
Dean Donald K. Anderson, University of Washington  
Dean Armour J. Blackburn, Howard University  
Dean James R. Kreuzer, Queens College  
Dean O. W. Lacy, Trinity College  
Dean Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J., Xavier University  
Dean Walter B. Rea, University of Michigan  
Dean David W. Robinson, Emory University  
Dean W. L. Swartzbaugh, Amherst College ...

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Is there a second to the motion?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Moved and seconded. Are there any questions you wish to address to Dean Williamson?

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE CLEVINGER: I wonder if Fred would relate the conversation with Logan Wilson about Commission VIII?

PRESIDENT WEAVER: I would be glad to say that in my discussion with Dr. Wilson, about our hoped for relationship in his working out of the future organization of the American Council on Education, I informed him of this project under Commission VIII and gave him a copy of the draft that was current at that time. I think it was the last one, actually. I asked him if the American Council would look at it, and I particularly wanted him to consider it because the American Council

itself stated in the annual report that one of its Commissions would sponsor a study having the same general objective as this one. He stated to me, just off-hand, that he thought the Commission of the American Council would leave it to Commission VIII of NASPA to do this. I think implicit in that was the feeling that this Commission was well organized, the prospectus well structured, and the general structure of it sufficiently close to the one they had to cause them to withdraw.

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Any further comments? Ready for the question? All in favor of accepting the progress report of Commission VIII say "aye"; opposed. It is so adopted.

Let me repeat again that, hopefully, perhaps before the day is out, copies of what we may call the prospectus which will be presented to foundations to secure support will be available for your information, and there is some reasonable hope that the Executive Committee and the Commission, working together, will be able to secure the funds necessary to support this important study.

Is there any more business anyone wishes to bring up at this meeting? If not, President Weaver has asked me to make this announcement: The Executive Committee will meet at twelve-fifteen Tuesday in the Poor Richard Room.

There being no further business, this First Business Meeting stands adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at eleven-forty o'clock...



## CONFERENCE LUNCHEON

Monday, April 2, 1962

The Conference reconvened at twelve-fifteen o'clock, Vice President Harold E. Stewart presiding.

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Will you be seated, gentlemen, as quickly as possible. May we have your attention please. The invocation will be given by Father Pat Ratterman.

REV. P. H. RATTERMAN, S.J. (Dean of Students, Xavier University): Eternal Father, teach us to pray -- teach us really to pray; not just in pious phrases thoughtlessly flung by pious custom toward Thy throne, but teach us to pray so that all we say and all we do is consecration anew of all we are to Thy praise, reverence and service.

Our whole lives must be our prayer. Our work must be our prayer. The deliberations of this Conference must be our prayer. The help and guidance we are called upon to give to the youth whom Thou hast entrusted to our care, all this must be our prayer.

Teach us so to pray. The humble reverence of frightened children seeking Thy guidance and counsel in this troubled world -- this is our prayer. The God-direction of everything we touch -- this is our prayer. The formation in the sons of men of Thine own divine image and heart -- this is our freedom and our prayer.

Teach us, Eternal Father, teach us Thy children how to pray.

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Be seated please.

... Luncheon was served ...

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Ladies and Gentlemen, I think it is perhaps time that we get this show on the road. I would like to call your attention to certain notables whom we have sitting at this table, all of whom are Past Presidents of the Association. On my right, Dean Don Dushane, from Oregon; Dean Fred Turner, University of Illinois; Dean John Hocutt, University of Delaware; Dean Ted Baldwin, Cornell; Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas; and Dean Don Winbigler, from California -- just the large state of California.

I would also like to announce that we have as a guest with us at this luncheon Joseph Kauffman, former Dean of Students at Brandeis University, and now Director of Training of the Peace Corps; and his associate Pat Kennedy. (Laughter) I make no comments on this. (Laughter) They will be with us today and, of course, are on this evening's program -- Mr. Kauffman is -- and if any of you would like to talk with Mr. Kauffman or Mr. Kennedy I am sure they would be most happy

to have you do so. I would like to ask them to stand so that you may recognize them. (Applause)

Without further ado, I will turn the program over to Dean Charles Henderson, who will introduce our speaker. Dean Henderson.

DEAN CHARLES HENDERSON (University of North Carolina): Thank you, Dean Stewart. It is my happy duty to introduce to this assembly today a man I am sure has much in common, one firm bond, with those of us who work with college students.

Professor Alan Keith-Lucas has devoted his life to the welfare of children -- his own children, other people's children, and especially those children without parents. There are two differences, however; Professor Keith-Lucas' children are real children, and while he might call them orphans, or foundlings, although there are very few orphans or foundlings today, we, in speaking of our own subjects might prefer to use some other appellation.

We are fortunate, as well, to have before us a man whose pioneering efforts in the field of group child care are now coming to fruition, both in his adopted South, and in the nation as well. He has many honors, and many more will come.

Professor Keith-Lucas was born in Cambridge, England in 1910, son of a don of Trinity College, where he himself in 1931 received the A.B. degree with first class honors. His master's followed in 1935, but his first six years of post-baccalaureate degree were spent as an English schoolmaster in the preparatory schools of that country. He then moved to this country and served with the Cleveland Humane Society in Cleveland, Ohio from 1939 to 1944, in the meantime earning his Master's of Science degree from Western Reserve University; serving briefly in the army in the Office of Civilian Defense, and finally, in the Children's Welfare Bureau in New Orleans, Louisiana. In 1944 he moved to Louisiana where he became the director of Public Welfare for that state. In 1950 he joined the faculty at the University of North Carolina where he served since that time and where he is currently Professor of Social Work, and Director of the Group Child Care Project.

In 1955 he was awarded the Ph.D. degree from Duke University, where I am happy to relate somebody finally remembered to bestow upon him the key to Phi Beta Kappa. And only last year, the University of North Carolina elevated him to its highest ranks by appointing him a Distinguished Alumni Professor of Social Work. A prolific writer and editor of books, monographs, papers, there was a period in 1958 where three books came out under his name in a six month period; a professional consultant for a wide variety of children's institutional agencies; an expert on children's homes, and on the legal aspects of orphanhood and foster care, on the

Christian values in the rearing of children, on the training of administrators in the field of child welfare, and an ardent and active churchman.

From his many activities and writings there emerges the picture of a man of deep understanding, of wit, of compassion and conviction; no mere intellect, but a living example of Christian energy in action.

I am reminded of the story about Aristotle, reported at least partially in Quintilian. The story goes that Aristotle, being censured for his extreme patience and painstaking in the rearing of young and obstreperous pupils, perhaps the case in point was, as young Alexander simply replied: "Maxima pueris reverentia debetutor," the greatest reverence is owed to children.

My colleague, Professor Alan Keith-Lucas, is one of those people who displays that greatest reverence to children, and I am proud to introduce him to you. (Applause)

DR. ALAN KEITH-LUCAS (University of North Carolina): Dean Stewart, Dean Henderson, Ladies and Gentlemen: I find myself here today with a good deal of trepidation, and a good deal of surprise; trepidation, I think particularly, because I know nothing about the work of a dean of students. To me, they are mysterious people who perform, I suppose, what might be described as decanal functions. (Laughter)

When I was an undergraduate, I had a tutor, a robed and gowned gentleman with speech impediment. (Laughter) The first day I was at the university, I took him a list of 12 lectures that I intended to attend. He struck out two-thirds of them. He said, "Tut, tut, Mr. Keith-Lucas, I don't think I would go to these lectures. These are very dull gentlemen, very dull gentlemen indeed." And this was virtually the last I saw of my tutor, except that he would meet me occasionally in the morning with the phrase, "I trust I see you well." (Laughter) So I am acutely aware that what I might have to say to you today may have very little relevance to a great deal of your job.

I am also surprised that you should have invited me here. A Professor of Social Work is usually a lonely bird on a campus. He is neither fish nor fowl, nor good red herring. (Laughter) When not being mistaken for a sociologist -- and this happens to me about five times a day -- he is looked down on by the academicians because he teaches something which is thought to be practical (laughter); and he is looked down on by the other professional schools, like law or medicine or business administration because what he teaches isn't practical. (Laughter) So you take a big risk today in having asked me to be with you.

When the history of this century comes to be written-- if, indeed, men are spared to write it -- it may be recalled

in a footnote that this was the century which saw the birth of the helping professions. Psychoanalysis, clinical psychology, social work, and many forms of counselling -- marriage, guidance, vocational, pastoral, and newspaper columnist. (Laughter) This, I uphold, is a profession. These are more or less twentieth century phenomena. I do not know to what extent student personnel administrators see themselves related to this movement, or see themselves as a distinct profession, but at least, whether they are concerned with direct service to students or with the machinery through which this is given, they are concerned with the same commodity, which is help.

It therefore seems important to consider what these professions have had to contribute to the world and to each other. To many people, and indeed to many of these professions' practitioners, this would appear on the surface to be clinical knowledge, applied diagnostically and resulting in something called "Treatment." I shall say very little about this knowledge, partly, I must confess, because I have some doubts about it except in very expert hands and in cases of gross maladjustment, and partly because it seems to me that the primary knowledge at which these professions have arrived is something more important, but less easy to prove clinically, less measurable (and thus less "respectable" academically), less well formulated even by those who know something about it, and yet more practical, especially in the area of need which confronts us most often. For helping, in my experience at least, is only rarely a matter of putting right what is obviously wrong. It is much more often concerned with helping those who are "all right" but are underproducing, or disappointing, or muddling through, or not quite making it, or not doing all that they should. This is true in my work and I imagine it is in yours.

This knowledge of which I have spoken is that of the helping process itself, how help gets to people, what it takes both to get it and to give it. It is nothing very new or surprising. In fact, some of its principles have been known for a couple of thousand years, but these are all too often forgotten and have perhaps needed affirmation from the new professions, which they have not always received. I would identify four principles which would seem to me basic.

First, help is not a commodity that can be handed to someone and expected to do the job. A service is such a commodity -- housing, a remedial course, a tutor, what have you. But help means help in using a service. What is given is, in fact, often less important than how it is given. What is given may be nothing more than the structure in which helped and helper exist -- in your case, I would imagine, classes, group-life, grades, tests, student government, fraternities and campus regulations. The problem is not so much to provide these things for a student. It is to make them available to him in such a way that he can use them to the best advantage.

Secondly, most people do not want help. In fact, they resist it. This may seem surprising when so many people appear to want and to welcome help. But most people want help only on their own terms. They want help that will not require any radical change in themselves. They want easy solutions to difficult and complex problems. Any real offer of help scares them, sometimes almost to the point of paralysis. They tell us what they are willing to take, which is almost invariably something that leaves the essential problem-- and the student or client -- unchanged. "If only I had a place to study, or a different roommate, or less distractions, or a more understanding teacher, then everything would be all right." These are not the real trouble, even though there may be reality in them. They are, all too often, externalizations of the problem, ways of refusing to claim it for oneself.

We can understand this reluctance if we examine for a moment what to take help really means. It means recognizing that something is wrong within oneself, something one ought to be able to handle for oneself. It means sharing this problem with someone else and letting him have some control in one's life. It means giving up what one has, the known, however unpleasant (and man has a way of making the known bearable) for new responsibilities, new efforts and no certainty that the future will be any better than what one has.

The church has long known this problem when it comes to divine helping and has never had any illusion about how difficult penitence is, or submission, or faith -- that surprising trust of which man is capable in things as yet unseen. But human helpers often forget that human help is just as difficult to take, and, if anything, more threatening than help from one's God, for one can trust God not to do too far, or to leave one stripped of all one's armor, not to let one down completely, when one cannot always trust a Dean, or, I might say, a social worker.

Thirdly, I think we know that the core of helping is making decision possible. Man does not fail to do his best because he does not know what it is that he should do. In a few cases this may be so but in general he knows it only too well. Nor does he fail, as a rule, for lack of conscious, rational will, which calls for a special definition of the word that we used -- decision. The church again has a word for it -- commitment. It is an act of the whole person which says, "This I want," and, "This I am willing to pay the price for." It is a phenomenon of which we still know very little in its positive aspects. We skirt around it when we talk about "motivation" but we miss its essential nature. For this we do know about it: it cannot be induced, or rationalized, or brought about by any combination of outside forces, whether these be praise or blame, shame, reward, punishment, persuasion or example. Nevertheless, it is what makes the difference. Doctors know it in the patient who decides to get

well despite the most hopeless prognosis, teachers in the student for whom a subject suddenly seems to "make sense," social workers in the client who overcomes social conditions that would break anyone else and gets a new hold on life; ministers perhaps know it best of all.

We do know, I think, something of its negative aspects. That is, we know some of the things that prevent its exercise. Chief of these is irrational fear, often below the threshold of consciousness, which holds man in a state of ambivalence. A student wants to do well with all of his conscious will, but he is also afraid of doing well because of what that will entail in added expectation on him, or in separation from his parents, or in giving up some protective image he has of himself, or even more because he does not want to put success or failure to the test. He may be afraid of his own strength, of what freedom would unleash in him, of facing what life is really like. Inside himself he plays safe, half wants to succeed and half does not, and in doing so only too often brings defeat on himself. Indeed ambivalence can be a paralyzing thing and may make a person act on a level far removed from his actual potential.

Fourthly, I think we know that help is sometimes available to people in a relationship with another. The right kind of relationship provides him, as it were, with a trial experience in which some of these fears can be dispelled. From it he gains a little courage to draw on in making decisions for himself. We know too that this experience cannot guarantee help but that it can sometimes make it possible. With that we have to be content. And we do know that what goes wrong with this relationship and makes help impossible is as often the mistake of the helper as it is the fault of the helped. Again, I do think we know something of the conditions which are under the control, nominally at least, of the helping person, which may make help possible.

The first is that this relationship must be a real facing of the facts. It must look at what is really happening and not deal in false reassurance or minimize the problem. It cannot say, "I'm sure you will be able to overcome this problem," when this may not be true.

One of my students -- and my job is, of course, to teach people to be helpers -- only began to take help when I was able to say to her, "I am beginning to wonder whether you can ever be a helping person." This may sound brutal, but I could not, in all conscience, take her problem away from her. Sometimes the worst things we do to students is to jolly them along, to help them over hurdles until they are brought face to face with the one that they cannot cross and are utterly defeated.

It follows from this, I believe, that this must be a relationship in which the helped person is free to make his

own decision, irrespective of what the helper wants. This may sound obvious, but is one of the hardest things actually to put into practice. I wanted my student to succeed but I had to risk her withdrawing on the spot. Yet this is the core of the matter. If what we are hoping for is indeed a real decision, a commitment to something new, the opposite choice must also be open. To say "Yes" sincerely always means that one can say "No." Man cannot live his life fully if he is afraid of death. I had to help my student see that much as I hoped that she would succeed I not only was not insisting on it but I could and would accept her decision to fail if she had to, and would honor and respect it.

Nor, of course, could I be sure that success in our particular undertaking was the best thing for her. I think that we have a responsibility to help people fail with dignity, to choose other goals than those to which we are committed, to decide responsibly that the price we are asking is more than they want to pay.

One of the finest pieces of counseling I have seen in your field was with a girl, an honor student in high school, who was failing miserably, and whom the student counselor helped see her desire to escape from her family's pressure and become the wife of a home-town boy. She left with her head held high.

What we don't want is no decision, the gradual erosion of utter defeat, and this is what we so often get when we insist on success for which the student is not ready or of which he is afraid. The worst thing I ever did was to refuse to let a student of whom I was very fond fail in one of my courses because of my belief in him. It took him two years to be able to tell me that he did not want to be a social worker.

It follows again, then, that this relationship must be one in which the helped person is free to explore and to discuss all of his negative feelings, even the most unacceptable, without fear of blame or offense. People usually need much more help with their negative feelings than they do with their positive, and to attempt to ignore the negative and concentrate on the positive, some popular preachers to the contrary, is often to give the negative strength. An ambivalent, uncommitted person can be likened to a block being pushed in one direction by common sense, the desire to succeed and the exhortations of those who are on the side of the angels, but held from further progress by a strong spring of doubt and fear and rebellion. The more pressure that is applied, the tighter the spring becomes. It is not only ready to rebound the moment the pressure is eased, but, if the metaphor can bear it, it can become coiled so tightly that the block is shattered against it. The sensible way to go about the problem is to uncoil the spring, and this can only be done if it can be examined closely. But so committed are we to the positive that we often find it hard to permit those we help

express their anger or their resentment, their doubts or their despair.

This brings us to a fourth requirement. This relationship must have one, and only one, purpose: the giving of help. It cannot have other aims, conscious or unconscious, however worthy or noble, such as the good of the university, of honor, or justice, or public relations. These are actually the things that come between helper and helped, that prevent one person from really listening to another. The fact that they will generally be the by-products of help is not a case in point. The helper must decide what he really wants to do. If these things are important to him, and more important to him than giving help at this time, then he should be clear about it and not pretend he is doing one thing when he is really doing another.

This is even more true, of course, about personal ends, such as the desire to be liked, or to control another, or even, more subtly, to have an image of oneself as a wise, or a helpful person. It is true to such desires as that to have a "pleasant" relationship with the person one is helping -- some of the most helpful relationships are stormy and even bitter -- or even to be a successful helper. True help is always a matter of letting oneself be used, never using the other person even for the best of ends.

Along with this goes the understanding that a helping relationship cannot be a relationship between inferior and superior, saint and sinner, or their modern equivalents, adjusted and maladjusted. Possibly the greatest bar to helping another person is to have overcome the same problem oneself -- overcome it, that is, and not come to terms with it. The same problem in another both raises the question, "If I did it, why can't you?" and threatens the often uneasy partial victory in ourselves. What one needs to convey to another is not, "This I overcame in myself," but "This is something I have had to contend with in myself and perhaps do not always manage to do to my own satisfaction. I know what temptation feels like and I can live through it with you."

Of course, there are natural inequalities, of rank, or age, of function, and to be no further along in solving one's problem than the person one is helping is to be of no help at all. But along with this helpful difference there must always be the likeness, the recognition of common frailty, the sense, if you like, of that most misunderstood doctrine, original sin, which is properly the mainspring of man's compassion although it has so often been used as an excuse for his inhumanity. And here I would comment that a healthy knowledge of man's frailty and an understanding of it in oneself is the surest way of finding the good in him, while, paradoxically, a belief in man's essential goodness and a belief that one is good oneself is the surest way to disappointment.

The necessity to meet another as an equal has nothing



has nothing to do, let me say, with theories that would eschew authority or with the kind of permissiveness that infected our thinking some years ago. That kind of functional difference is often a necessary part of helping. It is the assumed or claimed personal authority which can be destructive, the "I know best" or the even more deadly, "Do it for my sake."

The sixth and last condition is simply that structure, that is, rules, regulations, expectancies, grading systems and the like, which many of us consider to be hindrances rather than helps to our relationship with others, may in fact be blessings in disguise. They are the given, the fixed points around which helping can take place, the reality, if you so wish to call it, that is not under our control. They are also the limits that prevent us from going too far, from invading areas in the life of the helped person to which he does not invite us. We may, of course, hope that there will be a certain flexibility, that justice will be tempered with mercy, but without such a structure the whole career of the helped person would be in our hands, and his powers of decision about what to do with unpleasant facts degenerate into a matter of satisfying us.

I well remember the horror with which my profession faced the restrictions of public assistance, when these were introduced in 1935, with its apparently rigid eligibility requirements, and what strength we have found in them, just as I remember the mistake that we made when we threw out the baby with the bathwater, the whole process of law as well as its unnecessary rigidities, in the Juvenile Court, and with what relief we rediscovered due process of law as a helpful limitation on what otherwise was becoming judgment by prejudice and whim.

All this may seem very simple and obvious. I think that in many ways it is, just as the Great Commandment is simple. But it is, as is the Commandment, extremely difficult to put into practice, and one is always discovering ramifications and meanings of which one had no idea. My students laugh at me sometimes because they say that first I wrote a book on the casework process which made it unnecessary to go to school; then I reduced the whole matter to three simple sentences which meant that one did not have to read the book -- and if my publisher's reports are true, this is obvious. (Laughter) But these are the three essential things which a helping person conveys to someone who is in trouble.

The first is "This is it." The second, "I know that it must hurt." The third, "I am here to help you if you want me and can use me." But none of these things is easy to say and really to mean. They demand courage. It is not easy, for instance, to court or even permit anger, sometimes directed toward oneself, or to risk wrong choices knowing that only with that freedom can a person possibly come to a right one. They

demand humility, never an easy virtue. They demand clarity of purpose, dedication to an objective, faith in a learned process and in man's ability to use it, patience, endurance and empathy. But above all they require self-discipline. This is perhaps the hardest part, and is something for which an academic career only indirectly prepares one. Or, am I wrong? Some academic careers, yes. In the school in which I teach we have much to overcome in the sort of schooling which produces conformity to accepted theory, the handling of facts as unrelated things to be collected and handed back to the professor, and insistence on easy ways to digest difficult material. But sometimes we hit on a real scholar and we recognize in him some of the qualities we are hoping to develop -- knowledge of himself, and of his frailty, a determination to seek the truth however uncomfortable, a disciplined and yet inventive way of going about things.

Perhaps the discipline required of a helper and of a scholar are not in the end too far apart, and a dean of students as well as a social work professor may in time lay claim to an academic respectability too often denied them at this time by the "guardians of the unalterable law."

Thank you. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Dr. Keith-Lucas, I think that applause testifies to the gratitude which we, who are often described as being engaged in the helping services, feel for your most thoughtful and stimulating address. I am sure these insights will help us be more effective in helping others.

Are there any announcements that should be made?  
Glen shakes his head.

This meeting is adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at one-forty-five o'clock ...

---

### THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Monday, April 2, 1962

The Conference reconvened at two-thirty-five o'clock, Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois, NASPA Historian, presiding.

CHAIRMAN FRED H. TURNER: I wonder if it would be possible to ask those people who are sitting in the rear of the room if they wouldn't move forward. It is possible that following this address we may get into some rather animated discussion, and it would be helpful to all of us if you were bunched up this way instead of bunched in the rear of the room.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we will get this Third General Session of the Conference under way. We have had two General Sessions. It has been generally agreed, I believe, that we have been lifted tremendously by the first two General Sessions. Now I think we will be lifted, but I think at this session there is a possibility that we might get into an area or two of controversy, and if that is so that is nothing new to this organization. That has happened before. We have had other controversies, and we have had a good time out of it.

Let me introduce the people who are at the speakers' table and tell you who they are and what they are going to do. Over here, on my left, is Bill Swartzbaugh, Associate Dean from Amherst; and next to him is Tom Broadbent, Dean of Students at the University of California at Riverside; and over at the right side is Vic Yanitelli. Vic, you are a quarterback and not a right end. At least you were when you played football. Vic is a Vice President of NASPA, from Fordham University. These three members are listed as a panel for resource and reaction. As far as that goes, the entire group is a panel for resource and reaction; and following the address we will open the meeting for discussion, questions, responses, and reactions. If you want to react, well, you may react, as long as you don't throw anything. We don't want any throwing going on this afternoon. We will save that until later in the evening.

The Chair will recognize questions and statements, either from the floor or from the table. Our reactors up front are expected to be ready with some reactions, but I suspect that we will get just as many reactions from the group as we will from our official reactors here in front.

With that, let me introduce John Alexander who is to introduce the speaker. John carries on a tradition that means a great deal to older members of this Association. I am sure the older members remember with great affection Nick McNight, who was one of our early members and who added a great deal of humor and pleasantry to earlier meetings. John, did you get to know Nick, or didn't you?

DEAN JOHN W. ALEXANDER (Columbia College): Very well.

CHAIRMAN TURNER: That's fine. Of course you did. You were there and knew him. You understand why we held him in great affection. We seem to be loaded with North Carolina. John is a native of North Carolina. He is a graduate of Columbia College. He did graduate work in sociology at North Carolina and at Columbia. He has been teaching at Columbia College since 1946, deaning since 1957, and has been associate dean of Columbia College since 1959. It is a pleasure to introduce John to you, who will then introduce the speaker. John.

DEAN ALEXANDER: It is my very real pleasure to be able to introduce to you my friend and colleague, Louis Hacker, who is Professor of Economics at Columbia University. I think he is very specially qualified for his topic this afternoon, which deals with freedom on the American campus, because he is an eminent interpreter of the American tradition in his many books and other writings, and in his classroom, and he has also been a dean.

He has a very interesting academic career. He went to Columbia for his undergraduate work and graduate work, and then entered into the field of full time writing; and he pointed out to me at lunch that during the depression he was neither on the government payroll nor did he ever get a hand-out, and he supported himself through these years as a full time writer, showing that it could be done. But after a very prolific writing career, he returned to Columbia. In the same year that I came in as a freshman, in 1935, he was coming back as an experienced writer, but as a freshman teacher, and he has been at Columbia ever since.

In 1946-49 he was the Harmsworth Professor of American History and a Fellow of Queens College at Oxford University in England. We heard a lot about him while he was over there. I think, as well as we can tell, he must have made quite an impression on Oxford, and I think America could not have had a better interpreter than Louis Hacker. He also lectured at Cambridge University, in order not to show any discrimination.

In 1949 he left the classroom in Columbia College where he had been one of our really great teachers. He is the kind of a fellow that when you go out into the country, meeting alumni in various cities, you hear the question, "How is this professor?" And one you always get asked about is Louis Hacker. In 1949 he became Dean of the School of General Studies at Columbia and was there for ten years, and he made a very important contribution in bringing this faculty, which had been a school without faculty status, for adult education, to the faculty of the university so it was now a full faculty, and he was its first official dean.

In 1958-59, when he decided to leave deaning and return to teaching, he took a year's retraining as a Guggenheim Fellow. I think this was his second time around on that, and we have been very happy to have him back in Columbia College since 1959 teaching in the classroom in Economic History. Since his coming back, probably his most notorious role -- he used the term "notorious;" I think he made a great contribution to education -- as the foreman of the grand jury in New York which investigated the TV quizz shows. He showed great probity and also great objectivity in this because two members of our Columbia family were, unfortunately, involved in this sorry mess, and Professor Hacker spoke strongly for scholarship in his work as foreman of that grand jury.

He is a prolific writer. I could not and would not try to list his books. I know that I studied American History from one of them. I forget the title of it now, but it was Hacker and Kendrick when I took it. Then I taught from two of his books later, a very fine book on history in the United States, entitled "The Triumph of American Capitalism," and one written for the American Civilization course called "The Shaping of the American Tradition." He went into the field of alumni relations in his writings about Alexander Hamilton and the American tradition. Hamilton was one of the early graduates of what was then Kings College, now Columbia College.

Last year, I was at a meeting where Marshall Stone, head of the Mathematics Department of the University of Chicago, was introduced. He was the son of Chief Justice Stone, and the man in introducing him said that Chief Justice Stone said that one of the greatest essences of accomplishment in his life was when his son read a book that he couldn't possibly understand. He felt that he had finally arrived. Well, I think Professor Hacker is on the way to achieving another triumph somewhat comparable to that. He has a son who is making a great name for himself in the academic world as an Associate Professor of Political Science at Ithica, and I guess if we were in Ithica now, or at a meeting of the Political Science Association now, I would be introducing him as Andrew Hacker's father; but he is still here in his own right.

Following many years of concern with the American Civil Liberties Union, Professor Hacker is now serving as Chairman of its Committee on Academic Freedom, and it is with that mantle that he comes to us today, but speaking from his long years of experience as a great teacher-scholar of the American tradition.

I was asked to announce before I introduced Professor Hacker that there will be a brief showing of Professor Hacker on WCAU-TV, Channel 10, seven p.m. or eleven p.m. I guess that is the news program this evening; something that was taped just before this meeting.

Now it gives me great pleasure to present to you

Professor Louis M. Hacker. (Applause)

DR. LOUIS M. HACKER (Chairman, Committee on Academic Freedom, American Civil Liberties Union): Dean Alexander, Ladies and Gentlemen: A person like myself when he ventures to address a public audience very frequently is at a loss as to a mode of salutation. This has happened to the most distinguished and most experienced public orators. It once happened to the famous and the now lamented Governor Al Smith in New York, who was summoned by a gentleman who at that time was the head of a great educational institution; to wit: Sing Sing, the New York penitentiary at Ossining, to deliver an inspirational address to his charges; and he met the same problem of salutation.

He started out by saying, "Fellow citizens," and then he realized that he had made a mistake because they were all felons and by that token they were there in Sing Sing and had been deprived of their citizenship. So he started again and said, "Fellow New Yorkers," but he again realized he had committed another mistake because many of them were involuntary residents of the State of New York. (Laughter) So he ended up by saying, as I do, "How good to see so many of you here today." (Laughter)

As a public speaker, one encounters all sorts of audiences, and what their reaction is one can never tell until their confidences are given to him, usually delivered in private at the end of the address. And this is one of the confidences that one of my listeners directed to me after I had finished a bout of speaking. She came up to me, in great perturbation, and she said, "You know, I've looked forward with great interest to your address because the subject to which you have devoted yourself has always confused me. Now that you have finished speaking I must still report to you that I am confused, but this time on a higher plane." (Laughter) And this may be part of the response I shall be getting from this distinguished assemblage.

One other story. This is the Lenten Season. My wife tells it to me. She says, "Why don't you try some of my stories on your audiences?" She brought this one home. This is about a distinguished dean in England who was delivering a sermon, and he was welcomed up to the pulpit by the verger, who said to him, "Dean, you must raise your voice when you are delivering this sermon. The agnostics here are terrible." (Laughter) Again I think that story is appropriate, (Laughter) to this assemblage. (Laughter)

I am going to address myself to the problem of academic freedom for faculty and for students, and raise some sticky questions. I should also tell you that outside of this room, for your pleasure and edification, are copies of the two latest policy statements issued by the American Civil Liberties Union in connection with the whole question of academic freedom for students, and you are welcome, of course, to help yourselves,

and I do wish you will because the subject is complex, the questions are thorny, and you may want to review these statements at your liesure.

It has become commonplace for academic orators and academic bodies, and even occasionally for men seeking public office, to pledge their undying fealty to the preservation of freedom in our colleges and universities. Thus, the president of one of our great universities said, "A university almost inevitably is out of step with the appointed community since one of its essential functions is to be a critic of conventional beliefs and values. With a view to extending the frontiers of knowledge and intensifying the appreciation of values, it must come into conflict with uncritically adopted mores and opinions. It is true," he went on to say further, "however, that the freedom the universities claim is not a negative concept. Universities' faculties have only one true, valid defense against attack; namely, that they demonstrate on demand that their educational methods, and their traditional foundation have been arrived at by trained personnel through the use of thoroughly rational procedures."

One might note somewhat wryly in passing, that this same university president dismissed, out of hand, three members of his faculty and without invoking those very tests he himself had carefully defined because they refused to cooperate with the McCarthy Committee.

And the distinguished Association of American Universities declared in 1953, and I quote: "Free enterprise is as essential to intellectual as to economic progress. A university must, therefore, be hospitable to an infinite variety of skills and viewpoints, relying upon open competition among them as the safest safeguard of truth. Its whole spirit requires investigation, criticism, and appreciation of ideas in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual confidence. This is the real meaning of academic freedom."

Having said this, the distinguished signers of the statement began to retreat, and I quote: "By ill-advised, though not illegal, public acts or utterances, the scholar may do serious harm to his profession, his university, and to education and to the public welfare." And ended by declaring, and I quote: "Above all, a professor owes his colleagues and the university complete candor and perfect integrity, precluding any kind of clandestine or conspiratorial activities. He owes equal candor to the public. If he is called upon to answer for his convictions, it is his duty as a citizen to speak out, and it is even more definitely his duty as a professor."

Thus, by qualification and concessions, in this case to the legislative investigating committees, the presidents of the country's leading universities were not only calling upon professors to surrender their rights as citizens to write, to speak, to associate, but, in fact, to give up that privacy

which all other citizens enjoy. For what else could the demand that the professor "answer for his convictions" do but open him to inquiry about his political, economic, social, moral, and religious beliefs?

Indeed, it was in line with this final, stern admonition that the president of a great state university ordered the dismissal of two professors as late as 1956.

I think it would serve our purposes better if, having first made a few rather obvious remarks, we examined those procedures that must be installed in order to guarantee those rights without which no freedoms can be maintained. Before I do so, however, I wish to call attention to what I regard as an increasingly dangerous schism developing in our colleges and universities between professors and administration in one sector, and students and administration in another.

We have started out by assuming that what differentiates the free world from the communist one is the existence of liberty in the first and authoritarian direction in the second. Liberty, we take it -- and this means liberty for the individual -- is indivisible, and that requires freedom of enterprise, freedom to work, and freedom in conscious association, press and speech. To maintain our free institutions we are prepared to make ourselves accessible -- and this means students as well as all other citizens -- to all ideas, whether true or false, so that by probing, sharing, and hypothesizing we can arrive at those truths that will make our life secure. It is only by the exposure to all opinions -- and it was of this that John Stuart Mill made his greatest point -- that some sort of certainty and consensus can be arrived at where rational thought and conduct will prevail.

There are dangers, naturally. Those who espouse unpopular causes will provoke dissent and run the danger of hostility, criticism and even punishment. Assuming the honesty of belief, and the absence of participation in secret and conspiratorial conduct, to what extent is the academic community prepared to protect its members? Its failure in many instances to do so -- and this is the peril to which I have just alluded -- will compel professors and students to turn to agencies outside of the university for their defense. What is likely to occur more and more if university administrative officials fail to identify themselves with the interests and needs of their professors and students is that they no longer will be spokesmen for their community, and that curious division will occur where protective organizations will spring up which, in effect, will split a world which should be unified instead of fragmented.

This, I think, is already beginning to happen. The Association of American University Professors, instead of contenting itself with making representations to university administrations, has recently installed a legal department,



and has already begun the practice of filing amicus briefs in legal cases where the rights of faculty members have been violated. The respondents are universities. The American Civil Liberties Union has again and again appeared as counsel for teachers. Laterally, students are beginning to turn to the American Civil Liberties Union for representation. The NAACP and, more and more, CORE have adopted the same role for both teachers and students.

There should be a warning here, a warning that this group in particular must pay careful heed to. If students run afoul of the law, whether it is intramural or extramural, whether it is a university regulation or a municipal ordinance, in the exercise of what they regard as their rights to petition, write, speak and assemble, if they will not get assistance from those who are there to counsel them and, therefore, are compelled to turn to others outside, then it must be apparent that the whole machinery you have been building up so carefully will be rudely shaken, if not destroyed. That mechanism can function only if it is based on mutual trust and forbearance.

When it is assumed, however, that college and university authorities have become an auxiliary of the civil authorities then there are the very real dangers that association will take place without rather than within the university; and that even prior consultation and discussion with university officials may be abandoned. You will have, therefore, devitalized your own authority completely and beyond repair if this should continue to spread.

I need not tell you that you are beginning to see evidences of this, although in minor fashion, already. The declining interest in student government is one example, and I know that one of your panels is going to direct itself to this subject. The participation in distant, off-campus demonstrations is another. The attendance at meetings and classes and seminars and summer institutes not connected with universities is still another.

We are living in a world of ferment, indeed explosive change, in which the making of decisions for private conduct and public policy requires the examination of many complex positions. Shall we or shall we not engage in civil defense alerts? Shall we or shall we not approve of nuclear testing? Shall we or shall we not push relentlessly determination of all sorts of discrimination and segregation? Shall we or shall we not recognize Red China, and the Castro-Marxist-Leninist government? Or the other end of the spectrum: Put an end to foreign aid to all countries whose ideologies are basically inimical to our own?

Not only do teachers and students seek enlightenment on these many perplexing problems. Rightly or wrongly, as a matter of conscience, they have already taken positions and are resorting to action. When the last is open and above-board --

that is to say when it is not conspiratorial and anonymous -- can we, having in mind our democratic commitments, dismiss them out of hand, or condemn them or, worse still, punish them?

It is within this context that we must examine more insistently than ever today the whole complex bundle of questions that have to do with the rights and the responsibilities of teachers and students and, indeed, the universities themselves.

I do not wish to say too much about academic freedom for faculties. The ground has been traversed often enough. A few points can be made, however, to which not enough thought has been given. In intra-university matters, increasingly significant decisions are being made by administrative bodies and governing boards without consultation with faculty, which fundamentally affect the nature and direction of the university commitment. I will cite a few examples where, to my knowledge, no effort has been made to canvass fully the interests and possibly the objections of the faculty themselves in connection with these broadening commitments on the part of universities.

There is a matter of government contracts. More and more universities, perhaps out of desperation, are becoming increasingly involved in the financing of all of their operations from contracts of this kind. In some universities more than 50% of gross income is derived from this source. In technological universities, I have been told, as much as 90% comes from national public agencies.

The problem is this: If government, in the interests of defense, or in the interests of health, or whatever, is more concerned with applied rather than pure research, have those people who are making decisions for the universities the right to do so without the fullest disclosure of all the relative information to the faculty members, and their approval? Another similar problem has to do with classified research. Many universities are accepting contracts in the area of the natural sciences that call for the classification of these materials. That is to say, the withholding from exposure and discussion by the whole university community, at home and abroad, of the findings of these particular projects. Should universities dedicated to the constant exploration of unknown frontiers, in addition to, of course, the tasks they assume of education and training for the professions, accept such limitations upon intellectual communication that the classification of materials entails?

Another one. What of the acceptance by administrative bodies and governing boards of the limitations imposed by federal law in connection with the granting of scholarships and fellowships under the National Defense Education Act, and under the law establishing the National Science Foundation? Without consultation, do the administrative bodies have the

right and are they, indeed, doing justice to the whole conception of a free university in accepting such monies knowing the inclusion of disclaimer affidavits within these laws, with all kinds of obscure terminologies that inevitably must give pause to students, undergraduate or graduate, seeking such assistance, when they try to recall whether or not they have knowingly been ever involved in conduct or association which may be, long after the event, questioned?

In other words, I am saying that this boldness of thinking, this willingness to topple over all sorts of ancient beliefs, at least to query them, and to disregard old and honorable shibboleths, that we say is one of the impressive and rewarding functions of the university, this frame of mind, encouraging bold inquiry that we say we want to instill in our students. Do we not ourselves place these very ideals in jeopardy when we tell students that any -- even though they may be wholly unharmed acts or conduct in which students may engage, in political or social discussion or association -- that any such conduct may be subsequently queried by government because of the signing of such a disclaimer affidavit.

Some of you are familiar with the case of a man by the name of Baronblatt who a long time ago, as a student, joined what he was prepared to assume was an innocent association; and then many years later was hauled up before a legislative committee of investigation, confronted by this early and what to many was innocent association, and his refusal to name those a long time ago with whom he had been affiliated brought him afoul of the law. He was charged with contempt, tried, and served a sentence.

I submit to you that when we tell our students whom we are asking to be bold that on the other hand there is a peril because they may be, long later, queried about their activities, we are encouraging exactly that timidity and anonymity that we seek to discourage and dispel in the classroom.

I raise these questions because I say the decisions that have been made on these three matters have been without consultation with faculty, and I deplore them as an example of the absence of that kind of frankness that I think must exist in a university community if there will be what I have already alluded to as mutual confidence and forbearance.

Then there is the very difficult and, as I have said before, thorny question of the role of the faculty person, and I shall bring up the same problem in connection with the student, as a citizen. Shall he, as the statement of the Association of American Universities in 1953 said he must, be held responsible publicly, and he must be compelled, if necessary, to give a full accounting of himself if he is queried as to his acts and his beliefs as a citizen? Why differentiate the teacher from the rest of society?

It is our position in the American Civil Liberties Union -- it is a position that with only a mild qualification has been taken over by the American Association of University Professors -- that the only thing to which a teacher must answer questions is -- and the questions can be put only properly by his peers, his associations and his own faculties, his own universities, his associates in his own learned societies -- and those questions have to do with his competence and integrity. Does he honestly, and does he with a proper, modest understanding of the boundless horizons of his subject, deport himself with that discretion that is required of a university person? Does he deport himself with that discretion in the classroom? And does he deport himself with that discretion outside the classroom? Beyond that, I cannot see how there can be any other tests employed in connection with the teaching profession.

In this case, therefore, it has been an important role that the American Civil Liberties Union has played for the purposes of laying out those procedural guarantees that will safeguard the rights of the university person when he is in jeopardy; that is to say, when his position is threatened as a result of clamors that are directed against him by outside pressure groups or, indeed, by alumni of his own university, or when he is haled before committees of legislative inquiry that want to probe into prior utterance and prior affiliation.

In consequence, therefore, the whole question of academic due process is of the utmost importance, and this is what I have in mind when I say that rights and responsibilities must be shared, that they must be shared by the university itself, just as it does by its members. And the English have a very pleasant term for characterizing its community. They refer to the senior members and to the junior members. The senior members are the professors, and the junior members are the students.

I won't enter into an elaborate analysis of what are the basic components of academic due process. I note that you will have the pleasure of hearing a distinguished law professor on another occasion address himself to the question of legal due process. I am talking about academic due process. I am talking about those rules and procedures which the university world creates for itself, and having established that, is rigorously guided by them in order to safeguard the rights of its members.

I should call to your attention, the American Civil Liberties Union many years ago printed a statement on academic due process. I should call to your attention, however, that as a result of the joint deliberations of the Association of American Colleges and the Association of American University Professors, a code outlining carefully all of the procedural guarantees was drawn up by both bodies and ratified in January, 1958. Obviously, both of these Associations could do nothing

other than prepare these statements hoping that they would be presented to the universities and to their duly created legislative bodies for adoption and implementation. In any case, I say that the whole matter of academic due process as far as professors has been laid out and approved, and it rests upon the universities themselves, through their orderly, constituted devices, to establish these procedures.

It is so important that we take awareness of this situation. In the early 1950's we went through what two writers euphemistically referred to as "the difficult years." That is to say, the period when Senator McCarthy literally rode herd on and terrorized our universities. Professor Lazarfeld, with a colleague, published a book called "The Academic Mind," that reveals, if you will, the nature of the weakness and the shame of the American universities in not protecting their members when they were under fire. The book "The Academic Mind" -- and I call it to your attention if you want a complete implementation of the success rather than the failure of the McCarthy terror -- was addressed to a sizeable number of social scientists only who were teaching in 165 institutions. And these persons reported among them 990 different incidents of administration action -- no, not university action, but administrative action -- which led to 188 dismissals, 40 forced resignations, 118 withheld promotions, and 99 other forms of discipline. The dismissals occurred in 102 out of the 165 institutions.

Professor Lazarfeld says that not only did at least half of those interviewed -- and there were more than 2400 persons who subjected themselves to this inquiry -- that not only did at least one-half of those interviewed detect a decline in intellectual or academic freedom, worse still, pressures, suspicion, and hostility created states of mind which had deleterious psychological and social consequences. The interviewees openly admitted their apprehensiveness of retaliation and their resort to precautionary devices to allay criticism, censure, and the threat of dismissal.

We are living in a similar, or somewhat similar time of stress. On the one hand, the House Committee on un-American Activities continues to regard teachers as suspect and makes them a leading target of suspicion and investigation. On the other side, the obscure, often anonymous attacks from the ultra right upon curriculums, books and teachers -- and this is spreading more and more into the country because the ultra right is much more capable than McCarthy was, organizationally, in view of the fact that it is moving more and more into local communities where these pressures could be brought to bear on boards of education and on other public bodies.

The result is, therefore, these activities succeed in undermining confidence in a free educational process. And I revert again to the theme I have been sounding here: If colleges and universities continue silent, as they did during "the difficult years," or as they did under the statement

of the Association of American Universities, where they called upon people to -- the euphemistic word is -- cooperate with McCarthy people, if they continue silent today, and if your curriculums are revised to conform to outside pressures and teachers are fired, then that erosion that set in during the early 1950's will reappear. This I regard as a serious threat to the authority we invest in it and to the confidence in it and the respect for university officials which, up to a decade or so ago, they had always enjoyed.

I turn now to the case of the students. I cannot give too much time to this. I cannot see how the freedom of students materially differs from the freedom of teachers. Their concerns are essentially the same. They are seeking, by probing, investigation, and hypothesizing, to examine every facet of opinion and belief, and by individual or joint conduct on the campus, as well as off of it, they desire to perform the functions of citizens. The requirements for the observance of their rights and the assuring of their responsibilities are similar to those I have laid out in the case of the teachers.

I will indicate some of them. Necessity for drawing up clear rules and regulations of a substantive and procedural nature. And how many of you are associated with universities that have done this, the drawing up of clear rules of both a substantive and procedural nature on the basis of consultation with faculty and with students, which are realistic and reasonable and are, therefore, guides to conduct? Second: Infraction of these rules must be safeguarded by the most scrupulous observance of due process. And this is what I mean by the procedural aspects as opposed to the substantive aspects of the codes. Such due process procedures include, among others, properly worded charges, particularly when suspension or dismissal is involved; the right on the part of the students to an adviser or counsel; the right to confront hostile witnesses and cross examine them. That is to say, confrontation is one of the most fundamental procedural guarantees we have in this country. And even the Supreme Court, despite the fact that it has been confronted by the communist conspiracy, has declared that materials which the FBI has been utilizing for the purposes of bringing people to book, who presumably are engaged in the advocacy of ways and means of overthrowing our government, that even such confidential material must be made available to the counsel of the defendants, if not exact confrontation itself. But I cannot see how any proceeding can occur unless this idea of confrontation with, of course, the proper right of cross examination will be observed.

I go on. The right, of course, to bring forward friendly visitors, and the right of appeal to a faculty-student body, or to a faculty committee itself.

The nature of the student activities which we regard, the American Civil Liberties Union Academic Freedom Committee, as being of proper interest, and which needs necessary safe-

guards, as far as the students are concerned, are, of course, diverse. They include many things. We have much to say about all of these, many controversial things, maybe many hard things, in the policy statements to which I have alluded.

There are references and discussions about the role of student governments, student clubs, student publications, student petitions as on-campus activities, and many references to the student as a citizen, and his off-campus interests, associations and concerns.

I just want to say a few things, at some length -- not too long -- about student forums in view of the fact that this whole matter was much in the public eye recently as a result of the action taken by the Associated Press against some deans of the affiliated institutions that now make up the University of the City of New York. The matter became one of national interest and, in fact, President Stoke, who was one of your speakers -- I think he addressed you last night -- was one of those among the presidents of the colleges making up part of the University in the City of New York who signed a brief which was repudiated by every reputable, legal group in the city. Indeed, so overwhelming was the hostility directed toward this brief which President Stoke, among others, signed that a retreat was beaten.

But I simply bring you up to date, and I just want to make some observations about discussion and student forums, in view of the fact that President Stoke also wrote a brief note in "School and Society" to which I call your attention, published on March 10, 1962, whose title is "Invitation of Speakers to the College Campus," in which he denies that students have the right to invite speakers to address them; that this is a concern that is a matter outside of their particular purview, and so I have some remarks to make about this that some of you may want to challenge; but in any case, all of this makes for horse racing, as you know. (Laughter)

What should colleges do about controversial speakers, whether they be communists, fascists, Black Muslims, members of the John Birch Society, or the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade? It is not enough to say that each in his own way is subverting our freedoms and by offering him our college platforms we are lending aid to a conspiracy. This is, in effect, what President Stoke said.

By that token, when Thomas Huxley wrote and spoke he was undermining the institutions of Victorian England and, undoubtedly, in the eyes of many, subverting that very firm society. That William Lloyd Garrison, when he counseled defiance of the fugitive slave law was fomenting revolt and rejection of the Constitution. That Bill Heywood, and the other leaders of the industrial workers of the world, when they advocated the general strike and sabotage was advocating devices of class warfare that could not but lead, if successful, to the collapse of the Republic, and possibly even in a sea of blood.

Agitators of this sort in Britain and America were never banned by law. We must not forget that the Supreme Court recognizes that the American Communist Party is both a political agitational movement and a member of an international conspiracy. In the first connection, members of a party may write, speak, and move about, at home at any rate. Membership, and this I want to recall to you -- membership in the Communist Party is not a crime. Otherwise, obviously, all our jails would be filled to overflowing. Incidentally -- and this I say wryly -- if membership in the Communist Party were a crime, then many of the members who belong to government counter-espionage organizations would be in difficulties.

If this is so, then who is the college administrator who wishes to say that such persons have no place on college campuses, notably so when they can be heard elsewhere? Their newspapers and books all can be read at leisure and their manifesto and programs studied. I can see no difference between having access on the campus to the written word and access to the spoken word. Indeed, as far as students are concerned, the latter has real advantages, to satisfy a normal curiosity to see and hear persons who are espousing unpopular causes, to ask questions on matters of doctrine and policy, to match wits and, therefore, expose the mechanical thinking of people who can but make a sorry appearance when absent from the protective screen of their massed followers and their hysteria they work up.

Indeed, on every campus where such meetings have taken place there have been no incidents, and not only has a debate occurred in an orderly fashion but usually there has been the discomfort of the speaker because of the knowledge-ability of the student questioners and their exposure of the mechanical thinking of the platform orators.

If such persons are subtle and skillful enough to make converts among students, as President Harold Stoke seems to believe, then not only are we saying that our cause is indefensible if it can be shaken by such a single exposure of our students, but we are also saying that all our teaching in the colleges and universities has been fruitless. We have been prepared to assume by study, analysis and discussion, and not by prohibition and censor, that students have been steeled to the blandishments of agitation and subversion. Why then do we read in the classroom Marx, Lenin and Stalin, Lassalle and Kropotkin, Emma Goldman, and even such a rebel like Henry Thoreau? Why do our libraries subscribe to communist newspapers and journals, as well as, if we can get them, to those of all the shades and nuances of the extreme right? How can we meet and disarm error unless we are exposed fully to it? Yet President Stoke says, and I quote him, "I doubt that the educational sacrifice students make in forgoing the privilege is very great in comparison with the contribution which the college makes to the communist cause in lending itself as a forum."

Let such a college and a president like Mr. Stoke simply



say, "We do not endorse these views. Indeed, we abhor them." If we do not let our students hear these people under our own auspices, exactly because we have declared them forbidden fruit they are likely to hear them elsewhere under circumstances we cannot control.

I feel similarly about student petitions and demonstrations, whether it is against the ROTC on the campus, or protests against civil defense alerts, and nuclear testing, segregation, or the hearings of the House un-American Activities Committee. On all these matters, American students have a long period where there was indifference to political questions, which so many of us deplored, which they are now beginning to feel deeply. These are matters of public policy about which the American people are becoming sharply divided, and many of them are acting, by public statements, by riding on freedom busses, by joining picket lines, by petitioning legislatures and the Congress.

Why should we assume that students who are directly involved psychologically, and the men among them who are our future soldiers, have a lesser interest or a right? Shall we forget so easily -- and here I am glad that Dean Alexander has indicated my link with one of the early alumni of Columbia College -- shall we forget so easily that the youthful Alexander Hamilton was an actor, when still at Kings College, in the growing protest movement against the British Crown? Or shall we forget -- and here I address myself to the Ohioans in your company -- the students of Lane Seminary, and of Oberlin and Antioch who defied the law, more particularly, the fugitive slave law, and who helped organize and participate in the anti-slavery crusade? They were students. They were breaking the law. And yet, these are the Hamiltons and the young people of the Ohio seminaries and academies. These are the heroes we fill our books with. These are the persons that we refer to with admiration, young people not yet wet behind the ears. Alexander Hamilton never finished college, by the way. He received an honorary A.B. degree long after the event. But these were young people who felt deeply and who felt that in their convictions -- and here I underscore this word -- matters of conscience required their participation when there were troublesome times around.

I would suggest, particularly if we do not wish our students to turn away from us and to seek aid and comfort elsewhere, where they might become the victims of dubious persons, among others, one: That petitions be admitted on the campus; that posters, circulars and handbills be displayed and distributed freely. Two: That demonstrations be allowed, subject always to the possibility that if local ordinances are violated the police may enter and arrest the participants. Students must be apprised clearly that this is a risk they run. Mind you, I am not saying they must break the law. They must take cognizance of the fact that the law is being broken. But what I want to make clearly understood is that laws are being violated as a matter of conscience, and justice tempered with

mercy requires that conduct on the part of administrators -- taking cognizance of the fact that laws must be broken -- should be the rule rather than the exception. And as I say, when disciplinary action seems necessary, this should be done only in terms of previously agreed upon rules, and with full observance of procedural guarantees.

Three: When students run into difficulties off the campus -- and this may strike you as being over and above the call of duty -- when students run into difficulties off the campus for taking part in sit-ins, picket lines, demonstrations, the least the college authorities can do, instead of yielding to the clamor for their expulsion or discipline, is to see that the students are fully protected in their constitutional rights. This is what I mean by saying that responsibility must be shared. And I cite some examples of these constitutional rights: That students be given fair trials -- not by police sergeants, which is too frequently occurring, but in a court of law where they are defended by counsel; that they are not abused by the police; and that charges be brought against the police. And I think that this is a responsibility of the college if this is proved to be so. That bail be sought and furnished. I am not suggesting that you bail the students out, although I do want to call to your attention that some very courageous college presidents have done exactly that when students have been booked by the local gendarmery. And another thing that is an important constitutional right: That such students have speedy trials and that appeals be taken if they be declared guilty.

I think it is important that you have in mind that the federal courts have begun to intervene in cases where students have been expelled for taking part in demonstrations. In the Alabama State College case, which was adjudicated in August, 1961, the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Southern District, in ordering reinstatement of students who had been suspended by the administration, found, one: That the student's right to complete his education was an interest of great value. Two: That the student could not be arbitrarily expelled. Three: That he had to be given notice of charges against him and the opportunity to present his defense.

I further want to call to your attention that the Supreme Court refused to grant the State of Alabama a certiorari -- that is, the right of appeal. The ruling, therefore, stands. And this is one of the rare times when the courts have intervened and the authority of administrative officers has been challenged. I need not tell you that up until now the courts have been reluctant to enter the campus where students have been suspended or expelled and to question the authority and the justice of the decisions that have been taken.

So I end up in these words. I am not making the argument on legal grounds; however, I am stressing the dangers as I have before -- a number of times before -- of alienation,

of the weakening of the confidence in college authorities and the resort to other agencies off the campus for support and defense. This would be a great pity. Indeed, a unique characteristic of the American educational institution would be seriously jeopardized in consequence, and it has been that community -- only the university in the British western world being similar to ours -- where students and teachers live and work together, in close association, where they feel free, by study, discussion and action to explore all those devices that strengthen a people and their freedom.

What I am saying is that college authorities have as much responsibility for maintaining that community, based upon mutual respect, confidence and forbearance, as do teachers and students. If we permit that community's fabric to weaken, then one of the great institutions of our democratic association -- and those of you who remember Aristotle remember that this was the ultimate defense of democracy, the plurality of association -- and I say that one of the great defenses of our democratic institutions, the university association or community, may be lost to us.

Thank you very much. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN TURNER: Well, sir, I think we should appreciate the calm, rather pleasant manner in which you have approached a problem which is difficult for many of us. I think we are ready now for questions either from the floor or from the table. If you are speaking from the floor, first give your name, so that Leo can get it into the record. Of course, if you don't want to be in the record you can say what your name is and "Don't put this in the record." But that is up to you. But at least, if you want to be in the record let us have your name before you speak. We are now ready for questions or comments from the floor or from the table.

I might say right here that there are a few Committees called for four o'clock and at least one is a rather important Committee, and I know Jim McLeod must have his group at four o'clock because of some commitments that have been made. If it is agreeable with you -- it is now ten minutes to four -- let's go until a quarter after four. Those people who have to leave may leave, of course, but we will go until a quarter after four and see if you want to go further. Can you stay until half past four if this is desirable?

DR. HACKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TURNER: We don't want to impose on you, but this is a hot subject, so let's keep it hot and work on it.

DEAN SHAFFER (Indiana University): May I ask if the Committee on Academic Freedom of the ACLU consulted with any administrative personnel administrator prior to issuing the statement which you are distributing out here?

DR. HACKER: No. Nor did we consult with legislative investigating committees; nor did we consult with the local police. I am not saying this ironically. I want to call to your attention who are the members of the American Civil Liberties Union Academic Freedom Committee. I am the Chairman. I was a dean for ten years. I had many relations with students. Almost every person on the Committee itself has had long experience as a teacher and has, therefore, had close relations with students. On our Advisory Council -- and you understand that our Advisory Council has approved this statement, just as has the Board of the American Civil Liberties Union -- we have Sarah Gibbson Blanding, the President of Vassar College, who has had much experience with her students; Brailsford R. Brazeal, who is dean of a college in Georgia, Lawrence H. Chamberlain, who is dean of Columbia College, Margaret Clapp, who is the President of Wellesley College, and so on down the list, including Harold Taylor, the President of Sara Lawrence, etc., etc.

You must not assume -- I hope the questioner does not mean this -- that this is the product of a group of visionary doctrinaires who do not know the university world. We know it only too well. We know its weaknesses, just as you do, only too well. And I submit, if the purport of the question is what is our experience, that that is it.

DEAN WILLIAMSON (University of Minnesota): I would like to ask a question for clarification, with respect to required confrontation, which I understand as a due process. As far as I know, I know of no institutions that, at the present, have a regulation requiring testimony from other students, nor do I know of any institution which has a regulation punishing students for giving false testimony. How can we require confrontation?

DR. HACKER: I am assuming a formal proceeding. Let us take the most obvious case, cheating, or plagiarism, or whatever. I regard this as a serious charge, where there is a real danger as a punishment of either suspension or dismissal. I think that a proceeding of that kind, because it does mean really not only the educational life of the student, but his future as well, the proceeding of this sort must be encompassed by the most careful safeguards. Take the case of cheating, for example. Suppose there is another student who is prepared to testify that there was cheating. I think that the accused has the right of confrontation, to find out how really accurate was the detection of cheating, and so on. You see what I have in mind about confrontation in such a situation?

DEAN WILLIAMSON: Supposing the other student refuses to give testimony?

DR. HACKER: In a court of law we expect confrontation, do we not?

DEAN WILLIAMSON: This is not a court of law.

DR. HACKER: I know it. But why shouldn't we have procedural guarantees in our own world to safeguard rights just as closely as in a court of law?

DEAN WILLIAMSON: I am not arguing the case for the desirability of it. I am asking: How would you enforce it?

DR. HACKER: Well, ask for it. Hope one can get it. I don't know. You will agree that protective devices of all kinds are of the utmost importance, particularly when the charge is a serious one and the punishment is likely to be even more serious.

DEAN WILLIAMSON: I agree. I agree. I am not arguing that point. I am arguing: Shall we now pass a regulation which will permit us, ahead of time, to punish a student who refuses to give testimony --

DR. HACKER: I didn't say that. I didn't say that. I said the accused was entitled to the right of confrontation.

DEAN WILLIAMSON: How do you enforce what he is entitled to, is my question.

DR. HACKER: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN TURNER: I think that this little debate right here brings out one of the most puzzling details in all of this new approach to things. I do not have before me the Alabama case to which reference was made. I am very much puzzled on how to interpret the fact that this decision states very definitely that disciplinary procedures in colleges and universities are not to be considered courts of law type of action. That appears in the decision; and this is the sort of thing Dean Williamson is getting into. I find myself puzzled in this proposal as it comes up. This seems to approach the court of law, and yet it is not the court of law, as this court decision says: This is not to be considered as making courts of law out of disciplinary cases. Yet we seem to be approaching courts of law.

DEAN JOHN F. QUINN (University of Rhode Island): I am wondering if Dr. Hacker would like to comment, just as a matter of information or discussion. I noticed that in your remarks you qualified your references to "due process" with the adjective "academic." I think this is important. Academic due process does not involve, for example, a charge of perjury, a legal charge against a student who either as a witness or as a person accused may not be legally forced to take an oath of affirmation. Would you have some suggestions as to how a student might be advised of the importance of his telling the truth when he appears as a witness for or against an accused student? I would like very much to hear your comment on that.

DR. HACKER: All right. I must confess that when I am talking about academic due process I am saying, to repeat what I have said, the desirability of clearly drawing up substantive and procedural rules, of having those affirmed by faculties, of having students apprised of them very clearly; perhaps even having them participate, because I think their participation does create a climate of, if you will, confidence. This is what I am seeking.

Now, in view of the fact that oaths cannot be taken, one must simply assume, given that climate of confidence, that there will be honesty of discussion. I do not know how those things can be enforced, I agree with you; and that is why I have differentiated between academic due process. In other words, self-governments, on a basis of clearly understood procedural and substantive rules.

DEAN QUINN: May I make another point?

DR. HACKER: I wish you would.

DEAN QUINN: Would you recommend -- and this is admittedly a detail -- that a student witness be formally advised to the effect that any of his statements which subsequently might be proven to be false would be cause for disciplinary action at a later date?

DR. HACKER: I would advise that, yes.

DEAN QUINN: Thank you very much.

DR. HACKER: I think that should be part of the code, yes. May I, in reply to what the Chairman said, say that the intrusion of the court in the case of Alabama was on the expulsion of students in a Negro college on the order of the Board of Education without, if you will, the autonomous action of the college itself. I think, in such a case, where the court pointed out very clearly that the right to education was an important right which was being infringed by such a conduct, the intrusion of the court here, to me, is of the utmost significance; and I must admit, in this particular case entirely justifiable.

I call to your attention the recent occurrence in the case of the shutting down of Alabama University, and a Negro university, again on the orders of a white governing body, in which the autonomous unit itself, the university, was not consulted, nor were the faculty or really the administration, or the students. I am wondering, in view of the fact that your Chairman brought up this point, that what he was saying about the failure of the consultation or the autonomous unit itself in this case, whether he is prepared to disagree with the conduct of both the Southern Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court?

CHAIRMAN TURNER: I am not prepared to agree or

disagree. I am raising a different question entirely; that is the intrusion of legal process as is stated there.

DR. HACKER: But I have indicated the specific circumstances, and I raise the question in the light of those specific circumstances; where there was no consultation with the autonomous body, and when the order came from without, whether such a legal intrusion was justifiable?

CHAIRMAN TURNER: I stand my ground on that, Professor, because the statement as it came from the court has this statement: That disciplinary procedures in colleges are not to be considered as legal matters. Now, you are not answering my question and I am not answering yours. We'll call it a draw there. (Laughter)

DEAN PHILIP A. TRIPP (Washburn University, Topeka): I think Professor Hacker has given us the paragon of the helping process. I could not help but envision a dean of students going bail for some students who had incited a riot and disturbed the peace by burning a dean of students in effigy. (Laughter)

I raise this kind of question, Professor Hacker, because it is a doubtful zone. It seems that it is your opinion, and the opinion of the American Civil Liberties Union, that it is the obligation of the university to go to the defense of students who may proceed without identification with the university, to wit, in a sit-in, or a bus experience, to go bail and this sort of thing. This is a kind of a twilight zone. I do not disagree with the view, but I do not know where it begins and ends.

DR. HACKER: All I am saying is that -- and this is where I bespeak your cooperation -- that in a climate of hysteria the punishments meted out are likely to be very severe, and that students will be held in filthy jails for a long period of time, and they will not have proper counsel, that the punishments may be excessive, and I know it is a favorite phrase of this group to talk about "inter loco parentis."

Here is a marvelous opportunity to serve in that particular role, to see that they are not the victims of police brutality, that they are not being punished excessively, and to give them every assistance which they, as a matter of conscience, and I believe that conscience is the guiding motive here, compel them to participate in what you and I realize, because there are laws and ordinances, may be illegal acts. And I refer again to all of those young people in our history who associated themselves with causes of this kind.

DIRECTOR ARTHUR E. GORDON, S. J. (Georgetown University): Dr. Hacker, could I ask your opinion on something? A number of universities have their handbooks contain a statement that reads something like this: "The university reserves to

itself the right to dismiss a student without specifying the reason other than that it is for the common good of the university." Could I ask you to comment on that, and then I would also like to ask Father Yanitelli to comment on that?  
(Laughter)

DR. HACKER: Our economists today are embarking on a rather interesting exercise. In fact, the President of the American Economic Association took this as his theme in his presidential address: That the education of our young people, given their proper qualifications, is a significant contribution to the gross national product. In fact, some economists are even saying that the concern with services like education and health perhaps may be even more important, in the long run, in speeding up the rate of growth in our gross national product than investment of capital in installations and of machinery. In other words, we are beginning to recognize that education is a very important function, not only of our society, but of its survival.

I, therefore, say that the reservation to any university authority of the right of expulsion, that the deprivation of not only this right of a student but of the possible potentially great loss to our community, is a right that should not be claimed. In other words, and again I refer to due process, because suspension and expulsion are really very great punishments meted out to students, these should be taken only after the most careful phrasing of the kinds of conduct meriting such action, and also the preservation of the rights of the students to defend themselves against such action.

There was going to be another question from our friend from Georgetown. He anticipated this answer.

DIRECTOR GORDON: I was going to ask Father Yanitelli to comment on it too, if he is able -- if he is willing, I should say. (Laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT VICTOR YANITELLI, S. J. (Fordham University): Thanks, pal. (Laughter) I would buy and subscribe to completely what Dr. Hacker has just said about not invoking this right. I would, however, put with it, and I would in all this discussion, while holding totally and completely for due process in the academic order, I would put with it always the realization that in the defense of freedom, and in the defense of rights, there is a double-edged responsibility involved; that as soon as I have a freedom to exercise, I am limited by the wall of your rights where the exercise of my freedom may transgress your right. And I would apply that to a university perhaps, or to any group.

While being against any kind of discrimination, I would still say that if left-handed pitchers want to organize into an association which admits only left-handed pitchers into this association, they have the right to do that so long as



they do not transgress the freedom or rights of any of their fellow citizens.

So in this question of due process, I would say that right exists, as Dr. Hacker said. I think it should not ever be invoked without due process. But I would say that the university has a certain right to be protected also from anyone, anyone speaking for it or bringing what these opprobrious newspaper statements call, you know, "ill repute" upon it. Thank you.

DR. HACKER: Certainly I would not dissent. How could I? I am constantly on trial, as Father Yanitelli knows, for everything I do and say, by my world, this university world, by my colleagues, my peers. If I engage in spurious research, or spurious publication, I expose myself to their censure, and I warrant it. This I agree.

I say that when I speak publicly, as I am speaking publicly here, I am speaking as an individual. Father Yanitelli knows that I am not speaking for my university. Father Yanitelli knows that when he just made that statement of his, he is not speaking for his university. We are in a world of freedom, exercising our rights as citizens to speak, divesting ourselves of association. The association I claim here is my affiliation with the American Civil Liberties Union; but I am here only, as the advertisements say, for descriptive purposes, as a Professor of Columbia University.

DEAN HOWARD H. HOOGESTEGER (Lake Forest College): I have two questions. Number one: Does the fact that in most of the private institutions the student comes voluntarily and affiliates himself with an institution which has an exclusion rule, does this in any way make it different than the public institution? In other words, the right of his voluntary joining, does this color it in any way? And then I have a second one, please.

DR. HACKER: The whole picture has become so mixed. The student comes to Columbia University, and Columbia University admits him, as your university does, wholly on the basis of capacity. But the picture has become so complicated because of the nature of financing of the universities. I no longer can differentiate between Columbia University and Indiana University in view of the fact that so much of it is coming from public money. And I do not see that it makes very much difference whether the student comes to a, technically, privately supported university, which is no longer being privately supported, or whether he comes, technically, to a publicly supported university. To me, both are universities, and both are there for the same purposes. Both choose their students and professors on the basis of capacity; both measure their continuation there by those rules and those rules alone. Why should we maintain a distinction -- up to ten or fifteen years ago there may have been a distinction -- when it no longer exists at this time?

DEAN HOOGESTEGER: If I can follow that up then, I think the second question would be like this: Few conduct rules can be written in such a specific fashion as to cover all cases, as we all well know. You eventually come down to judgment. Now, in some cases, where you have difficulty with confrontation -- and I agree with Dean Williamson very much; it is one of the most difficult areas in student personnel work -- where you have this and yet, at the same time, you have gone through reasonable due process, and you have, in your own conscience, researched the problem as deeply as you can and you have clear evidence, carefully researched, that guilt has been established and you make the judgment that expulsion is in order, if you please, then it seems to me that perhaps the student's voluntary association with this type of situation may be different than the other one. And I, for one, would have no particular qualms of conscience about a final decision to expell in certain circumstances, even without the confrontation issue. Would you care to comment on that?

DR. HACKER: Well, I agree that the question of confrontation, as the other speaker pointed out very clearly, in view of the fact that oaths cannot be given in such a proceedings, you have other difficulties; but that being the case, I am not questioning expulsion, once given the clear statement of the rules, as to what the offenses are which are likely to lead to what I regard as a very dire punishment. I am not questioning that. I am simply saying, if the rules are clearly understood by everybody then students and faculty are put on notice, are they not? This is what we mean by rules of law, do we not? Whether the rules of law are statutory or constitutional law or common law, there are certain requirements that we demand of rules of law: That they be universal in their application. That they can be properly enforced. And that they are universally understood.

If those rules of law are laid down, and if the punishments are indicated, then I do not see why there should be any question about them. The reason why I brought up the case of the two colleges in Alabama, and there was a similar one in Tennessee, was that there was no due process internally, autonomously, as I defined it.

CHAIRMAN TURNER: I am sorry to tell you that we can have only about one more question. We are going to be invaded in just a few minutes by a whole crowd of television operators, and when they come we will have to get out.

FATHER FLOYD L. STANTON, S. J. (Marquette University): I was wondering whether or not, Dr. Hacker, you might give us something of a definition of a student demonstration? In other words, I can conceive of a student demonstration, perhaps, in favor of some aspects of civil liberties, and I can also conceive of a student demonstration where literally thousands of students might be wandering around the city streets because of a decision to drop football, or a decision of a faculty

committee not to allow the football team to participate in a post-season game, or something of that nature. In other words, if we are in favor, or would like to permit students to express their opinions by means of a demonstration, where do we draw the line on that?

MR. HACKER: I am not a lawyer, so I cannot quote the law; but demonstrations are permissible by law, if certain rules are observed -- if they are orderly, for example; if they are not destructive; if they do not jeopardize property and personal rights. I allude, for example, to picketing as an example of demonstration. The courts and the law are quite clear, are they not, as to what will be regarded as proper picketing, and what will be regarded as an exercise of an activity which does jeopardize property and personal rights? You will agree with me on this as an example. Even mass picketing is permitted by the courts, as long as there is no danger to personal or to property rights. By the same token, if a riot takes place, Father -- which is your university?

FATHER STANTON: Marquette.

MR. HACKER: If a riot should take place, obviously, that is not a demonstration because of the kind of dangers to which I allude; but by "demonstrations," I mean the things we have encountered today: picketing and the massing of persons in protest against the conduct of public officials, and whatever.

You take the case, the one that is perhaps most sensationally in our minds, the student demonstrations in San Francisco in 1960, in connection with the House un-American Activities Committee. There has been much confused testimony on that, we know. There has been violence on the part of the police we know. We know the police brought their fire hoses out without prior warning and turned them on the students. We know that 60 students were subsequently arrested, presumably for rioting, but every one of them was discharged by the courts.

There are extreme examples, but one must differentiate, as I say, between riots which get out of hand and demonstrations which are characteristic activities in our democratic life.

CHAIRMAN TURNER: I am sorry, but I think we will have to wind this up. Professor Hacker, my own institution's faculty has recently fixed up a theory and a policy which has been adopted by the institution on picketing which says that picketing is an accepted form of demonstration, except for one thing: No classes are to be picketed. (Laughter)

I might add one other thing before we close, and that is this. About thirty years ago, on my campus, we changed our disciplinary procedure from an administrative procedure to one handled by the faculty, and the first faculty chairman was a

man long since gone, Professor Schmidt. And Professor Schmidt started in very enthusiastically, and after one year he said, "For God's sake, just get me out of this any way you can." He was followed by Professor Brittan, who still teaches out in Hastings in California. He also started out enthusiastically and he said after one year, "Any way you can, for God's sake get me out of this."

The only thing I could wish for the students of Columbia is that they had a man of your vision and point of view serving on their disciplinary committee. (Laughter and applause)

... The Conference recessed at four-twenty o'clock...

---

#### MONDAY EVENING SEMINAR I

April 2, 1962

J. DON MARSH, Assistant Dean of Students, Wayne State University.

Given April 2, 1962, 8:00 p.m., Seminar I.

#### STUDENT DISCIPLINE: ADAPTING CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITIES TO CHANGING SITUATIONS

In editorial comment upon a recent U. S. Supreme Court ruling which held that students in a tax-supported college are entitled to a hearing before expulsion, a mid-western journalist expressed his doubts of the application of the court's decision to all such institutions -- in this ultimate of student disciplinary action -- with the following observation:

"We suspect that the general rule of campus life will be what it has always been -- that when the dean of students informs the culprit that he is persona non grata said culprit will pack his bag, sell his bicycle, and silently steal away."

My initial reaction to this editorial comment was one of disbelief and even indignation. What gross oversimplification! What inexcusable affront and disservice to institutions of higher learning! In one brief paragraph purporting to comment upon the present, I lamented, this octogenerian journalist -- antiquated in his understanding and appreciation of the American campus scene today, if not actually decrepit in chronological age -- implies that our collegiate institutions are still practitioners of those forms of inhumane, repressive, capricious, and arbitrary student disciplinary control techniques characteristic of our medieval

and early colonial antecedents.

Recovering from my initial emotional reaction to what I had interpreted as attempted editorial "cuteness," I was sobered by a recognition of the possibility that the writer was expressing a sincere belief -- one, unfortunately, shared by many persons. It is not surprising, I reflected, that readers of such factual misrepresentations -- parents, students, and even faculty -- are led to conjure up all the hoary and stereotyped illustrations of real, or alleged, disciplinary injustices of the past and uncritically associate such practices with campus administrative officers today under such descriptive appellations as "Old Rocks and Shoals," "The Executioner," "Old Blood and Guts," or "The Great White Father." Picturesque, even humorous, as such imaginative monikers may be, their employment illustrates the misunderstanding and suspicion associated with the roles played by collegiate disciplinary officers.

If this be the case, I reflected, then the anger I had initially directed toward the editorial writer was off target. You and I -- indeed all educators -- have done little to combat the continuance of such uninformed opinions regarding the administration of student discipline. I suggest that it is our responsibility to take the initiative in creating a wider understanding and support of the more humane philosophic changes of attitude American campuses have experienced in recent years with respect to the administration of student discipline as an integral part of the total educational programs of our respective institutions. Personally, I am unacquainted with the existence of any institution of higher learning today still practicing forms of capricious, repressive, and arbitrary student control. Any such occasional practices encountered today are accidental rarities, recognized as incompatible with the objectives of democratic education, and as such are speedily rectified.

Historically, the first American universities and colleges were founded under private auspices, either by charter or articles of incorporation. They were granted a great deal of administrative freedom in the conduct of institutional affairs -- including those of student discipline. Early public institutions were permitted similar discretion, subject only to the distinction that they were instrumentalities of the government and therefore subject to the wishes of the people as expressed through their elected representatives. With the passage of years from their founding days, private institutions have continued largely unaffected in their freedom of disciplinary action -- subject only to the restraints dictated by a sensitivity to their public image, attitudes held by benevolent endowers, and the continuance of loyal alumni support. Publicly-supported universities and colleges, on the other hand, have experienced changes of constitutional provisions or regulatory statutes enacted by state legislatures over the authority vested in the officers of such institutions. Today, all states authorize their public institutional governing boards

to exercise disciplinary control over their students either by the delegation of authority implicit in the broad powers of such governing bodies, or by statute delegation to the faculty or administration of an institution.

Traditionally and legally, it has been commonly held-- both for private and public institutions of higher learning -- that students implicitly agree to conform to all rules and regulations, written and unwritten, of the admitting institution and are subject to such disciplinary measures as may be adjudged appropriate to their deportment for as long as they continue in student status. Thus, a college or university is held to be in a fiduciary relationship to its student body and accepts the obligatory responsibilities of a trustee. It acts in loco parentis to its student population. That is, it is viewed as exercising the rights and responsibilities of a parent -- without malice or unreasonableness -- to the end that such action serves the best interest of both the student body and the institution.

In the present evolutionary state of the internal structural development of American universities and colleges, you and I -- professional practitioners of student personnel services -- have, almost without exception on our separate campuses, fallen heir to the continuing responsibilities attendant to the implementation of necessary student discipline. Happily, few of us -- whether our administrative titles be those of Vice President of Student Affairs, Dean of Students, Dean of Men, or Counselor -- endeavor to discharge our responsibilities to our students and institutions in the resolution of serious instances of deviant behavior without the assistance of one, or more, deliberative or consultative bodies (i.e., non-academic faculty disciplinary committees, student governmental and advisory bodies, student disciplinary committees, or student-faculty advisory councils.) In general, however, for each of our respective institutions one of our number is expected to provide the leadership, and accept the responsibility, as the primary administrative officer for the coordination of disciplinary functions which directly affect the present and future welfare of students charged with the violation of institutional regulations or those alleged to have engaged in unacceptable behavioral exploits.

Unacceptable forms of student behavior demanding official cognizance and action by university officers are scarcely a new phenomena on the American campus. A review of the literature dealing with deviant student conduct over the years does not reveal to me anything strangely different in reported progenital form from that encountered on our campuses today. Apart from certain uniquenesses of expression reflective of the time of commission, the forms of student misconduct confronting student personnel workers today closely parallel those of the past. Ranging from the infinite varieties of misconduct representing a high incidence of lesser, though irritating, infractions to a sharply decreasing number of major and seriously deviant forms, collegiate officers today, like their

predecessors -- are concerned with the following general types of unacceptable student behavior: minor infractions of regulations and misuse of campus privileges; a plethora of semi-serious misconduct, generally in the form of short-lived altercations of a personal-social nature; a distressing variety of miscellaneous digressions such as plagiarism, cheating, and unethical behavior; and, last -- happily, still more rare -- instances of disorderly conduct, theft and burglary, and sexual misconduct.

Though the forms of unacceptable student behavior may not have undergone any significant changes over the years, the administration of campus discipline today -- generally speaking -- is the product of major revolutionary change, philosophic and procedure-wise. In the handling of student disciplinary cases on American campuses today, when was a student last heard whimpering under a lash or cane and such corporal punishment justified on the grounds that highly desirable benefits accrue to those who learn to endure severity in all that concerns the body? What active student personnel officer of your knowledge proceeds in the discharge of his responsibility as an educator piously guided by such an antiquated concept as that based upon the natural depravity of youth? Though I do not suggest that we, as student personnel administrators, have reached the millennium in the handling of the student conduct problems with which we are confronted, I am firmly convinced that a state of enlightenment has finally enveloped the American college scene in the area of student disciplinary concerns.

A more humane and realistic approach to student discipline is common to our campuses today. Student personnel administrators have -- finally -- been emancipated from their earlier roles as "campus wardens" and correctly see themselves as being educators -- not robot-like enforcers of rigidly codified rules and regulations nor vengeful punishers of student offenders. As educators, the campus is no longer viewed as a sort of penal institution or seat of child therapy. It is, rather, recognized as an educational institution wherein an educator's primary task is to assist students to develop the highest forms of personal habits, values, and ethical behavior while they seek to realize the intellectual potential which brought them to campus.

While not ignoring the needs and best interests of the institution, today's "educator-disciplinarian" is more concerned in identifying the needs of the student body and understanding the causations of group or individual deviance than he is in protecting the institution's reputation. He is motivated in his student relationships by a search for effective remedial action as opposed to the easier -- though unpleasant -- way out in the form of punitive action, including the major surgery of expulsion.

Interestingly enough, and I suspect many of you have learned it the hard way, efforts to effect remedial action in

the handling of disciplinary cases is not infrequently met with indignation and disfavor by a sizable segment of the campus population and the public. It takes considerable intestinal fortitude, a sincere conviction of one's painfully arrived at prognosis of the rehabilitative potential of the student offender, patience, hard work, and considerable professional skill to withstand acceptance of the gratuitous suggestions of severe punitive actions tendered by other administrative officers, faculty members, governing boards, and occasional editorial writers.

Fortunately, the "educator-disciplinarian" of today is acutely aware of the difference between a repressively-rigid-authoritarian student relationship and one which, though firm, is tempered by a philosophy and implementation emphasizing humanitarianism, understanding, and helpfulness. Disciplinary action is, I hope you will agree, associated with professional failure in the mind of today's student personnel worker. Yet, when such disciplinary action is necessary, and adjudged consistent with a student offense, no matter how severe the penalty imposed, the implementation sought is such as to make that action as much a learning situation for the student offender as possible.

Upon release from service in the Armed Forces at the end of World War II, I, like many of you, returned to campus life. I was impressed by the many changes that had taken place. Not only changed in the sense of physical plant, but in the character of the institution I had known. From discussions with colleagues at other schools I gather they too discovered such change upon returning to the campus scene. Most of us agreed that the most obvious change was the tremendous physical expansion programs underway, expansions still in process in most cases. In general, we all were a bit amazed at the astronomical student enrollment increases, a numerical growth still barely contained by our maximum facility capacities.

Apart from such physical and numerical changes, however, most of us professed to recognize still another change of paramount significance -- an alteration, or transformation, of the composition of our respective student populations. Since my school is an urban institution, and I could discern such change, I believe I fully appreciated the magnitude of change observed in student composition by my friends from more traditional "campus" colleges. My friends and I have since concluded that, starting with the peak years of returning G.I. students and continuing to the present, our campuses have attracted student populations of a personal, social, and economic heterogeneity beyond anything previously experienced.

Married students certainly evoke no surprise even within our undergraduate programs; swelling financial aid assistance (i.e., increased scholarships, G.I. benefits, N.D.E.A. loans, etc.) have helped to make educational opportunities available to many whose economic resources would have precluded



any serious consideration of college training in years past; sizable foreign student populations are no longer considered exceptional; the tremendous technological advances of our society during and since World War II, and the educational requirements for desirable employment positions in recent years, have combined to cause us today to consider a Bachelor of Arts degree the equivalent of the high school diploma of 25 years ago. Even with rising admission requirements, nearly all institutions of higher learning have experienced difficulties in meeting the admission requests of eligible and promising young people. Yet, at no period in the history of our country have we seen such efforts as are displayed today in offering encouragement to the academically promising -- from all strata of our society -- to reach for the educational "gold ring" of college admission.

It is my contention that this somewhat dramatic transformation of our student populations since World War II has had a singular effect upon our institutional philosophy and implementation of student discipline today. This increasing heterogeneity found within our student bodies has sounded the death knell for the strict authoritarian, and regimented student-administrative relationship once resentfully tolerated by more homogeneous, and numerically smaller, student populations of the past. Our respective campus communities have come to appreciate that appropriateness and maturity of student behavior is more positively attainable by examples worthy of emulation, by understanding persuasion, and by more humanitarian educative efforts to modify unacceptable behavior than that possible if we would place our reliance upon purely punitive control techniques.

Punishment, as a student discipline technique, has largely been supplanted by a marshalling of the increasing resources of our campus student personnel services for the more effective and lasting means of "helping a deviant student to help himself" in throwing off his cross of unarrested censurable behavior. Today's "educator-disciplinarian" is, hopefully with the full cooperation of the student offender, intent upon assessment of the rehabilitation potential of the student and not the levying of immediate and pre-ordained punishment. The end objective is to help the offender correct a deviance of behavior by a treatment that is appropriate. Such treatment, however, demands first a diagnostic effort of the most thorough nature and may easily involve the aid of all of the specialized personnel services available to a college officer, such as: psychiatric assistance, psychologically trained counselling aid, health service consultation, exhaustive review of academic and personal records, testing and measurement assistance, and the study of the offender's student activity participation record.

In my opinion, our respective student populations today are not quite as ready as their predecessors to accept campus disciplinary practices without engaging in some serious questioning of the appropriateness of existent standards or of

the fairness of disciplinary actions. In part, I attribute this questioning to the increasing heterogeneity of our student bodies. Personally, I applaud such questioning and appreciate the stimulus supplies for institutional self-examination of existent rules of conduct and disciplinary practices.

Today's students bring still another new factor to campus which I consider of significance to any examination of student discipline concerns; namely, an increased personal experience in democratic living. By and large, they have enjoyed a far greater personal involvement in what George B. DeHuzar would call "do-democracy" than that experienced by their predecessors of 25 years ago. They are far less satisfied with "talk-democracy," and, in my observation, far better prepared to question and probe institutional procedures which they feel may impinge unfairly upon them, or which they view as threats to their continuance as citizens of the campus community. During the past year some of you may have encountered a sort of campus re-discovery of the legal concept, in loco parentis. I sincerely hope that such re-acquaintance was characterized by a rational and unemotional examination of this legal relationship which exists between a student and his institution. Yes, I am aware that capricious, malicious, arbitrary, and unreasonable control of students can be, and has been, perpetrated behind the respectability of such a concept. However, I am supremely confident that our students, if not scared off by administrative fearfulness of the consequences of frank and open discussion, will, themselves, discover that suspicioned paternalistic excesses are exceedingly rare and seldom escape detection and correction. Indeed, I believe our students will be quick to realize the fact that they are the beneficiaries of an institutional concern and understanding dedicated to the completion of a graduate product of not only trained minds, but of sound characters and well-adjusted personalities.

Still another major concern of those of us engaged in the area of student personnel work is that of insuring "due process" in the hearing and disposition of cases sufficiently serious, if sustained, to justify such major penalty actions as suspension or expulsion. It is understood that the procedures followed in any student disciplinary case should be such as to insure complete fairness to the student charged with even the most minor misconduct. However, in challenged major disciplinary actions the courts correctly apply more rigorous tests of the "due process" accorded the student in their review of appeal. According to legal authorities, the essential element of "due process" is that "good cause" exists for the disciplinary action. Ordinarily, a proven grave or serious violation, or repeated less serious deviations, of institutional standards of student conduct would satisfy the judicial interpretation of "good cause." Procedurally, however, while legal counsels of several collegiate institutions are agreed that a student disciplinary hearing need not include all the rules of evidence demanded in a court of law (i.e., testimony need not be given under oath; technical

rules of evidence are not held mandatory), insurance of "due process" demands that:

1. The charges preferred be made sufficiently specific as to insure the student's understanding of their nature;
2. Such charges be presented to the student well enough in advance of the scheduled hearing to afford reasonable time for the preparation of his defense;
3. The student be afforded an adequate and fair hearing and, though not mandatory, be privileged to be represented by counsel of his own choosing;
4. A reasonably adequate summary of the nature of the testimony of witnesses against him be furnished if such testimony is given other than in his presence;
5. The student, or his counsel, be permitted cross-examination of witnesses giving testimony against him in his presence;
6. The student be allowed to testify in his defense and to present competent witnesses with knowledge relevant to the charges made against him;
7. He be permitted to present a statement or argument with respect to the issue of his guilt or innocence, as well as to the penalty to be imposed if the charges are sustained; and last,
8. That all evidence presented be given full, careful and conscientious consideration to the end that the hearing will result in a fair and just decision.

I recognize that many different points of view are held with respect to the guardianship responsibility a collegiate institution may properly exercise toward its student body--difference between students, faculty, administrators, even between student personnel practitioners like ourselves. However, our friend and colleague, Dean E. G. Williamson, has provided us a philosophic point of agreement in his recent book Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities, when he wrote:

"As an educational institution, a university should be above reproach in its fair and mature handling of student incidents and misbehavior -- not because of asserted or claimed rights, but because higher education should establish procedures and precedents that are morally right and demonstrably congruent with the best traditions of liberal and democratic education."

## MONDAY EVENING SEMINAR II

April 2, 1962

Seminar II, "New Patterns for Student Religious Groups," convened at eight-twenty o'clock, p.m., Joseph C. Gluck, Director of Student Affairs, West Virginia University, Chairman, NASPA Commission VII, presiding.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: I think all of you know, who are here this evening, that one of the panels we have is the panel that has to do with the religious activities on campus; and most of us who work with students are aware that over the past few years, at least to my mind, especially since World War II, on the campus most of us, I think all of us, have seen a really new interest in the religious organizations, the growth of religious organizations, and the interest among students on the matter of religion as it is evident on campus.

This evening, we have a panel topic which was given to us called "New Patterns for Student Religious Groups." As the interlocutor of this little conversation we will have together this evening, I think we are very fortunate to have with us four people -- as a matter of fact, five people with the young lady to my left here who shall be drawn in as a resource person. These people are working or have to do with national programs that are operating on campuses from coast to coast in particular religious fields of the three major faiths.

This evening, we are going to be informal, I hope. We have discussed this before, and after each person is called on for a little opening statement, we hope that we can involve ourselves in some conversations back and forth on this particular topic.

My name is Joe Gluck, and I serve as a Dean of Students on a state university campus of about 7,500 students, in which, on my own campus, we have been involved in a considerable growth of religious organizations, student organizations, with all of the implications we have there of what we might call togetherness in the religious work we have together.

On our campus we do not have a director of religious activities. The Dean of Students' office, in which I work, we share together with the religious workers on the campus those responsibilities. We have had a very fine relationship, especially in the last ten years. I am very much interested myself, this evening, to have met these gentlemen at dinner, and I am going to call on each one of them just the way we have them listed in our program.

I hope you will feel free, each one of you, to speak informally to this topic. We don't know exactly how we are going to come out because each man comes from a different

background, and we hope that by having this sharing we can see a wider picture.

So, first of all, I would like to call on Father Charles Albright. You will notice here he is the Executive Secretary for the National Newman Club Federation. Father Albright, we are glad to have you here and we would like to hear from you.

REV. CHARLES ALBRIGHT, C.S.P.: Thanks very much, Dean. It is a real pleasure for me, and I am sure for the rest of the panel, to have an opportunity to speak with a group of this type because certainly those of us who have worked on campuses know that our closest contact with the university has normally been through the Dean's office, in one way or another, even in those schools in which there are religious coordinators or directors of religious activities, they seem to be connected directly or indirectly with the Dean's office, and so certainly a mutual understanding on our part of what we are trying to do and what you are trying to do in relation to us should be of real help.

In the particular title of this panel for this evening, "New Patterns for Student Religious Groups," I am sure that as far as the Catholic church is concerned there has been considerable new development over the past 10 or 12 years.

Just a few figures -- not that statistics themselves are important, but I think they do help to bring out some of the change that is taking place. When I first came into the national office for the Newman Club Federation in 1955, I could count 100 fulltime chaplains throughout the country. I added them up again this fall, after getting all the returns in, and I find that we have 193 serving on campuses this year. Actually, that number has increased since the beginning of the school year. There have been at least five fulltime chaplains that I know of that have started their work when the second semester began. One other indication of this growth. Again, seven years ago, there were about 75 to 80 centers of one kind or another. When I say "center," it can mean anything from a small house where the chaplain may live and use the first floor and the downstairs for a combination lounge, lecture hall, classroom, chapel, and so forth, to a number of centers around the country that are rather full plants, taking their place along side the rest of the growth in physical development of the university.

I do not think that there has been any other factor that has been more responsible for changing the picture, as far as Catholic work on our state college and university campuses, and other non-Catholic colleges, than the appointment of a fulltime chaplain. I certainly know that many of the problems, if you will, that deans have had in the past with chaplains has been due to the fact that this was a parttime work for them. Their principal interests were centered in a parish. Their time was not their own. As a result, I think

they always felt a little bit ill at ease on the campus, were much more apt to be wearing a chip on their shoulder, and many things that I think they imagined were affronts and slights at religion, that he fulltime chaplain, once he gets into the work, does not encounter. Where this is now the work of a fulltime chaplain, I think many of you already have found this to be true: That some of the things that were constant sources of friction, or even sometimes major problems, certainly diminished with a degree of professionalism on the part of chaplains.

Certainly there has been a change in attitude on the part of the church in this country, on the part of our bishops; and I would say very remarkably on the part of priests in Catholic college work. We were highly suspect a few years ago. We have always felt that education, from beginning to end, should be a Christian education, and certainly in the context of the culture, the civilization and so forth in this country, normally that could be accomplished only through Catholic institutions. And so, certainly for many, many years in the history of this country, there was a reluctance on the part of church authorities to look like they were abdicating this ideal of a Christian and Catholic education from primary school right on up through college.

There have been a few factors, however, that have entered the picture. First of all, when you look around you and realize that our Catholic colleges are enrolling somewhat over 300,000 students, and as closely as we can estimate -- and I am convinced myself that it is a conservative estimate -- there are nearly 550,000 Catholics attending other than Catholic colleges and universities, it becomes obvious that if this ideal of a Christian education is to be maintained that we have to bring it to the student if we cannot bring the student to the institution where this can be easily, and in the normal course of the institution itself, provided.

So partly just with the change, if you will, and the force of numbers, there has been a greater concern, and bishops are concerned to find priests that they can put into the work fulltime, providing facilities so that this work can be carried out effectively and efficiently.

I think, also though, that there has been another change within the American scene that has accompanied this and partly been the background to it. There has been a considerable change, a social change, if you will, among Catholics in this country. The general social status of Catholics has changed over the past generation, signalized, if you will, by a Catholic being elected President of the United States. But I think it is a symbol of a more general change throughout the country.

When you stop to think that a generation ago, first of all, considerably fewer Catholics were attending college

than their percentage in the population was concerned, when you find that they were people with a sense of social insecurity who were looking upon an education as a means to better themselves economically and socially, some of the challenges that an immature Catholic student would meet at a secular college or university could well be the undoing of his religious adherence. It was a real danger, if you will, to the faith of the Catholic student.

There are still challenges in America and in the American university that can end up the same for a Catholic student, but I do not think it is nearly as prevalent when he does not feel this sense of social insecurity, when he no longer feels that the religion is a handicap to him socially and economically. Recognizing this fact, I think that with this change it has become a little easier to give a little more positive impetus to the work of the church on the campus.

I do not want to talk all night, but it seems to me that this is a background, perhaps, which is a little bit more peculiar to us than some of the other groups, although perhaps it has its applications elsewhere too.

Certainly with this growing change there has been a general change from just a student club being the whole of the operation to a real apostolate to the whole campus. In other words, when a university chapel or university parish is set up, certainly then the priests involved are looking at the whole university as their parish, if you will, as their field of operation. So they do become concerned then with the university and its whole life in a way that they never were, and couldn't be when all they were concerned with was just a little group taken out, you might say, from the university that they had some kind of a sort of protective care over, and at least tried to save their faith, and so on.

We find that today's Newman Center is normally, first of all, except in our urban universities, a parish. But it is a particular kind of a parish. It is a parish for a university group -- students, but also faculty, administration and staff -- those who are Catholics at the university. There has been, certainly, a fast growing realization and greater and greater impetus to the idea that it also has to be an intellectual center, a cultural and intellectual center; that if these are students and their life is basically whatever might be the fringes of it, still basically a pursuit of knowledge, a pursuit of learning, study and so forth, then certainly the work of the Newman Center has to be an intellectual work. With that also it must be a social work, if you will, in its narrow sense, and its broader sense, providing association, a recreational program for those students who need it; but far more important, to develop a sense of social responsibility in the Catholic students on that campus, not only just for themselves but for the whole university campus, and leading from there to their communities as they grow up, and even on a wider basis.

So there is this changing pattern, if you will, and changing development. Many of the things, essentials, if you will, of the Newman Club program, religious, intellectual, and social, have always been there, but the emphasis is certainly changing.

I could go on all night speaking, but I won't belabor you with that, and we will hope that through questions maybe I can bring out more points that would be of more and specific interest to you.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: Thank you, Father Albright. You will notice here, if you have your program, that on our panel the second guest we have with us is a gentleman who flew down from New York. I did not get to say "hello" to you, but I know that you had a hard day before you arrived here. You flew down, didn't you?

RABBI BENJAMIN M. KAHN (National Director, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations): All the way.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: Rabbi Benjamin Kahn is the National Director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations and has very kindly agreed to be with us this evening to give us a pointed view from the Hillel Foundations which operate on many of our campuses across the country today. So we are very happy to have you with us.

RABBI KAHN: Thanks. Dean Gluck said earlier that he is not sure how this will come out. I am not sure how I am going to start, which is a much more difficult problem than ending, although you might not think so before I am finished. (Laughter)

I will take just a few minutes, although I don't think it is necessary after Father Albright's introduction, because much of what he said is applicable also to the Jewish community, in order to elaborate just in some respects and define a little more closely the status of Jewish students and Jewish student work on the university campus.

It would be unnecessary here to analyze the sociological developments of the Jewish community of America. Suffice it to say that Hansen's law is operative in the Jewish field. That is the law that the grandchildren accept what the children have rejected. The process of adjustment of the Jewish community of America, from what was primarily an immigrant generation at the turn of the century, is virtually completed today, and the Jewish students in America today, like Catholic students, Father, I guess, feel themselves accepted and adjusted to the American way of life. Some excesses which characterized the previous generation, rejection of older traditions, of the necessity, or the presumed necessity, to overthrow a tradition in order to prove your adjustability, these no longer hold force in the third generation of Jewish immigration, which is primarily the university student generation.



So what we are finding in the American Jewish life today is an acceptance of one's identification as Jewish, and in a converse relationship the general integration of the Jewish student into campus life as a whole.

The numbers of Jewish students attending universities continues to rise. As of now, two out of three young Jewish boys and girls who graduate from high schools matriculate to a university. This number, although we thought we had reached the saturation point a couple of years ago, continues to increase. In absolute numbers, there are about 250,000 Jewish students in American colleges. At the present intended or anticipated growth of the American university system, by 1970 there should be a half million Jewish students on the campuses.

In itself, the figure is not particularly significant, but what is worthy of attention is the geographic spread of Jewish student attendance at colleges and universities, which is a factor that is making an impact with many attendant problems particularly on small colleges and universities outside of the cities.

The Jewish community, by and large, has been an urban community. The concentration of Jewish population has been on the East Coast, now with the West Coast beginning to move up in relationship. There have been few Jewish students at small colleges outside of the large centers, a trend, which I say, is presently being reversed. Let me illustrate that by our own work. There are many kinds of Jewish student work at the universities and colleges in America today. The B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations is the only nationally organized agency for this purpose. There are some schools, like Columbia or NYU, which have independent Jewish student centers or operations. There are an additional 200 colleges and universities in America where the Hillel Foundations conduct the Jewish student work. We have today 170 colleges which are on record as requesting the addition of Hillel service on these campuses. Most of these colleges are in small, rural areas, or in state areas which suddenly have seen a tremendous rise in the percentage of Jewish students on the campus.

Unfortunately, or fortunately -- I am not altogether sure; or shall I say I am sure one day and unsure the next -- we are not identified with a particular religious denominational group. Within the Jewish communities, I think you know, there are different approaches. They are not denominations; they are different philosophies of interpretation of Jewish theology or Jewish identity. We are not identified with any one of these groups. We call ourselves, if you will, trans-denominational. That is, we represent the totality of Jewish tradition, the variety of Jewish approaches, of the tremendous fluidity within the Jewish tradition.

So we are, ourselves, a community on the campus, a Jewish community on the campus, in which students of all types

of religious backgrounds, or none, if you will, are provided with the opportunity to express their particular needs as Jews in those areas and in those directions which meet their intellectual and religious convictions.

We are sponsored by a Jewish fraternal order, which is not a religious organization but a fraternal organization. As such, we are able to preserve a certain degree of welcome independence from the individualistic religious pressures which frequently are associated with types of denominationalism. Of course, it creates problems too because we are not always, to be honest, able to serve the needs of all students, religious or theological, adequately, although we make every effort so to do. But there is an aspect to Jewish experience in which I believe this stricture does not apply. That is, shall I say, the non-religious, or the supplementary to the religious, or as some contemporary philosophers of Judaism would say, the civilization aspects of Jewish experience. A person can be a Jew without being theologically identified, or even without subscribing to conventional or traditional theological presuppositions and, thus, it is possible for us to work in the area that Father Albright referred to as the intellectual and the cultural area without any reference necessarily to a particular religious tradition.

So we conceive of our role on the campus as the vehicle, first, for the expression of the religious identifications and convictions of the individual students; and simultaneously, or second -- and sometimes these roles are reversed in priority, depending on the particular campus -- secondly, as a vehicle for the communication of the intellectual and cultural heritage of the Jewish people to the Jewish students, and through them to the community at large.

We look upon this as a kind of a functioning within a pluralistic society in which we are convinced that the inter-faith movement, so to speak, has no meaning unless there is faith. Unless you have within the individual faiths the strength of conviction and identification, the inter-relationships between or among religious groups achieve no depth and no meaning and no dimension.

I will stop at this point, Dean, if you don't mind, although I don't think I could talk all night. (Laughter) But I could say at least a few more words, because I think it is more important in the presentations that we are making to leave time for the most important part of it, which is the discussion among ourselves, I will stop at this point.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: Thank you very much. I think you all can see that evolving very quickly here is an interesting pattern or a spectrum that we have here which gets wider as we go along with this panel.

The third person listed here you will notice is a gentleman by the name of Bruce Maguire -- who has a nice pipe

over here and I would like to borrow some of his tobacco, if I may, before we get any further into this. (Laughter) I knew he had some good Dutch tobacco. Mr. Maguire is here representing the National Student Councils of YMCA's, and out of his experience and the program of the YMCA's on many of our campuses we are very glad to have him here this evening to have him give us a picture of the current movements in their program as we have it today. Bruce, we are very glad to have you.

MR. BRUCE B. MAGUIRE (Executive Secretary, National Student Council of YMCA's): Thank you very much, Dean Gluck. Dean Gluck and I were talking about the way in which we were both contributing to the outflow of American dollars by our both smoking different kinds of Dutch tobacco. (Laughter)

I would like to say, to begin with, that having been here since yesterday afternoon, I find myself deeply appreciative of the opportunity that has been mine to be a part of this experience. I must confess to feeling a tremendous sense of community of interest between what we in the YMCA and YWCA conceive as our goals and our ways of work and those of the WASPA organization. The addresses of Dr. Stoke, and Dr. Keith-Lucas, and Professor Hacker have all been very real stimulus to me. I certainly accept Dr. Stoke's thesis that the extracurricular, or the affairs in which you and we are involved, should be a supplement and not something that will subvert academic objectives. I think I was thoroughly fascinated with Dr. Keith-Lucas' interpretation and exposition of the helping process, which I conceive of as the kind of relationship which a student YMCA secretary ought ideally to have with the members of an association.

I was struck, this afternoon, with the interest of this professional society in the whole area of freedom and responsibility, an issue which we in the YMCA and YWCA have been dealing with, as you have, in these recent months. Several of our associations have come to some real testing points around this question. And in the address of Fred Weaver, the kinds of things about which he was anxious, and the kinds of goals he saw for your profession, were the kinds of things which we care about.

This is probably a shorthand and not too adequate way to say it, but it might be said that your profession exists to free students in the search, so that they are free to search for and appropriate the truth of the university. We share this objective with you. We seek to work at this through providing experiences of service and fellowship, in which students working together, and in the relationship of peer with peer, seek to achieve goals which they set for themselves and which are in the direction both which enable them to appropriate the truth of the university and the truth of their historic faith.

The history of the YMCA movement has been one where the institutional base has shifted several times. In its first

years, the institutional base was largely in the university. Universities appointed men as YMCA secretaries. I suppose in one way it would be fair to say that your predecessors, as well as mine, may have been YMCA secretaries. YMCA secretaries served on the campus as the nearest thing there was to personnel administrators, handling housing and counseling and parttime jobs, and a whole plethora of things. This they did with one-half of their time, and with the other half of their time they carried many of the functions of the various religious organizations represented by Father Albright, and Mr. Kahn, and Mr. Nakajima.

The next period in the YMCA's history -- although I should say that in some universities it still is university based -- it moved from that to a period of seeking to have its university base primarily in a relationship with the Protestant denominations in a variety of cooperative efforts. This resulted in the creation of some student Christian movements in some parts of the country, and some united Christian associations in some others. There are still some of our member associations which are represented in this type of institutional structure; but by and large, and as we look to the future, our associations are more and more based in the total YMCA movement. We want, and we still see the objective of the associations as being primarily oriented to the universities. We see their leadership nurtured in the churches, but we see their institutional base in the Young Men's Christian Association movement.

One of the most hopeful signs in the present history of the YMCA is represented by the kind of exploration and experimentation which is going on in some larger urban areas, where the YMCA of the City of Chicago, the YMCA of Newark, New Jersey, the YMCA of San Francisco, of Akron, Ohio, Washington, D.C., are involved in the kind of searching out for the roles which the YMCA can currently play in relation to the needs of students, and the providing of experiences for them in the way of constructive service.

The program approach which characterizes the YMCA in these days is increasingly one of working at the developmental tasks of college and university students. This is a term which we have borrowed from Eric Erickson and some of his disciples, where students and young adults generally are seeking for their identity, for an ideology, and in terms of relationships, intimacy. These more generalized objectives, or tasks, are worked out in relation to questions of vocation, of the choice of a life-mate, of the kind of social relationships one establishes, the kind of concept he has of his role in society.

The student YMCA is seeking to develop its program direction in terms of these needs and these tasks, and the exploration which is going on in some of the cities which I mentioned is very much in this direction.

Let me give a bit in the way of statistics. The student YMCA at this moment has about 240 associations. The student YWCA has something over 300. Each of the association movements has about 50 staffed associations, and the balance of the number in each case is made up of those that are led by volunteer faculty advisers. The YMCA and YWCA have a publication with which you may be familiar. This is called The Inter-Collegian Magazine, of which I have some copies, and will be glad to have you take a look at them; or we can pass them around if you would like.

There are a number of projects which the YMCA and YWCA carry on -- some of these jointly. We have had, for instance, in the last five years, about 100 students who have participated in exchanges with the Committee on Youth Organizations of the Soviet Union. On the YMCA side of the house, we have a group of students who are going this summer to Lima, Peru, in a work camp. Groups have gone in the past to Turkey, and to Liberia. We have a new development in the international area with a year's internship program in which students serve as associates on the staff of an indigenous YMCA overseas. This year we have four men in Hong Kong, Istanbul, Lima, and Caracas, and we hope to have as many as eight involved in this kind of program during the next academic year, students who are, for the most part, finishing in June of 1962.

We are engaged in a process of rethinking our purpose, role and function. The YMCA was involved in a study a few years back, conducted by the Columbia University Bureau of Applied Research. We received some clues from that study which we have been seeking to follow, but we have also been hammering away at our own concept of what we should be. I have a document here called, "What Kind of Student YMCA Do We Want?" This is a document which was created for in-the-family use, but I am glad to share it with you and, indeed, would welcome any comments which you have related to the concepts, I should say, which are not completely in harmony with each other, because in each case there are several alternative proposals suggested related to statements of purpose and statements of nature.

I have here also a publication of the YWCA, "She Searches for Meaning in Her College Life Through the Student YWCA." Mrs. Norton is glad to make those available to you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: Thank you very much, Bruce. Without further ado, the last gentleman here sitting around the table with us this evening comes to us representing the spectrum of the Protestant religious groups, the denominational groups, through the National Council of Churches of Christ. Reverend K. Arnold Nakajima, as I understand it, you were to speak not only from your own particular church background, but for the entire group. Is this true, or maybe I am giving you too much of an assignment?

REV. K. ARNOLD NAKAJIMA (Commission on Higher Education, National Council of Churches of Christ): I suppose that I can say that I am filling three roles this evening: primarily representing the National Council of Churches of Christ Commission on Higher Education united campus projects, as well as the new movement known as the United Campus Christian Fellowship, and from my own -- what shall I say -- church orders, the United Presbyterian Church, being the Eastern Area Secretary of the Division of Higher Education.

Let me at the outset state that the Protestant-Christian churches have been vitally concerned and interested in higher education for centuries. This interest in education has been evident in American churches since the nation's early days, prior to the Civil War. Most colleges and universities in our country were founded under church auspices. Many are still related to the church in one way or another, and new ones are being founded from time to time.

The churches, however, took relatively little formal interest in the campus ministry within our private or public supported state colleges and universities until very recently. We are indebted to the YMCA and the YWCA for their introduction of the basic concept of the campus ministry, or basic understanding of our ministry on the campuses. The first Christian bodies to develop major work in these institutions were the Y's.

Early in this century, the churches began this work in a small way, and since the 1930's virtually all the churches, Catholic and Protestant, as has been noted, have increased their college and university work. So statistically, we can say that there are over 700 fulltime staff personnel involved in professional campus ministry. And if we were to add part-time workers, the number may well go to 1,200.

At the same time, the so-called ecumenical movement has influenced the churches and their movement in colleges and universities. This movement has been fruitful in many ways, often informal and personal, not of great public notice, among the Protestant, Evangelical, and Orthodox ecumenical fellowships, the establishment of great national and international ecumenical fellowships; namely, the National Student Christian Federation of the National Council of Churches, and the World Student Christian Federation. In some places, it has led churches to decide to do their work on the campus together rather than separately.

Thus, with this understanding, the National Council of Churches, until recently, have sponsored cooperative ministry, engaging two or more agencies of various denominations in a joint ministry on particular colleges and universities in the country. This has varied all throughout the country in terms of participating agencies, and each one of these situations are complex and can be defined in the context of their own situation.

The most recent contemporary movement for Christian unity is the United Campus Christian Fellowship, whose aims and declared ways of work have some implications for the larger ecumenical movement. The strange, restless, new baby struggling to be born is a merger of student organizations of United Presbyterians, the Disciples, the Evangelical United Brethren, and the United Churches of Christ. Each one of these campus ministry agencies have received their national approval to engage in cooperative joint ministry on the local level.

The movement was constituted in August of 1960, and it has yet to find its national structure. Already we see evidence of joint cooperative ministry under the banner of the UCCF in many of our larger and major university institutions.

A brief word about our own concept of the ministry. From a concept of what may be called student work, we now think in terms of our mission and ministry among all the segments of the university's population -- students, American and foreign, graduate and undergraduate, faculty, administration, and the allied staff of the universities and colleges.

Second: From a simple concept of what was known or declared, some 20 years ago, of following our students to college, we now think of the church's mission and ministry as one of service among those who are members of the churches and those who, because of doubts and questions, are not church members, and those who have no religious life at all.

Third: From talking about protecting students, or getting them into the program, we now seek to make possible a community of acceptance and support, one which is not so much protective, but liberating. We want not so much to shelter the students as to help them to grow, to help them to be free, to take risks, to act and move intelligently into the life of the university and the world.

We are no longer threatened today by the university. In my own time, I recall that my parents declared that if I were to go to the university I would lose my faith. We do not agree with this position at all today. We feel that in the eyes of God, under Divine grace, the institution of the university can be made an instrument to make truth known.

I think I will reserve my further remarks of all new innovations in campus ministry for discussion as the questions are asked.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: Thank you very much, Arnold. I am sure what has been said thus far, for those of you who are in the group here, that some questions have already arisen. May I say at this time that we are honored to have with us too a young lady here who is representing the National YWCA movement and I suspect that she would be willing to answer some questions.

Would you like to get involved in some of the questions?

MRS. MARGARET NORTON (National Student YWCA): I would like to tell you a story and get involved in that way. Perhaps you have heard the story. On some army base they were having an aquatics event, and each geographical group of recruits were to send a representative to help participate in this aquatics event. But there was one little area in which there were no swimmers, and so when the representative from this area came to the meeting, the director of the event said, "My land, how in the world did they ever choose you?" And the response was, "I was the only one who wasn't afraid to wade." (Laughter) And I feel a little bit, in this masculine society here, that maybe I just wasn't afraid to wade.

I think maybe I would add a couple of things to what Bruce has said. As you know, the YM and YW have had a very happy and good relationship over a long period of time; and this we hope will continue. But we are two movements, and we do move in different directions from time to time, and we have the freedoms in our relationship so to move.

One of the concerns of the Student YWCA in this period ahead, I think, is really to be a partner in this unfinished task in the education of women in higher education. We feel that there are many ways in which we have not completely explored, as educational institutions, or we, our part in it; in the whole area of the way in which women are educated, whether the education of women has just grown out, you see, of the basic pattern of education for men, with the assumption that women learn in the same way; whether there are new changes that are taking place in higher education, in which we have a role.

I understand that there is a good deal of doing away with integrated courses in the higher education scene, and as we think of the wholeness of education, we see that we have a role to play in this.

Well, these are just a couple of remarks. I would be glad to join in the discussion.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: May I suggest now that you gentlemen who are sitting in the same kind of a seat that I sit in, perhaps you will have questions of this panel, these people, in terms of how you see the program, the religious expression on your own campus. I think you men realize, as we get started here, that there are men in this audience, this group, who represent both large institutions and some very small institutions. Last evening, one of our Commission members was talking to me about his situation, in which it was a small, church-related college, and as he described his campus I could hardly find my own campus in this picture. I had to go thinking back to a small church-related college which I attended some 25 years ago to rethink about this question, because I had been working for 15 years on an entirely different situation. So



I hope you will feel free, all of you, whichever kind of a campus you come from, whether state supported, whether it is a church college, whether it is large or small, to join in this discussion. I would like to have you feel free to ask questions from your own point of view.

DEAN ROSS R. OGLESBY (Florida State University): We have recently developed a practice of hiring a chaplain who does, I guess, what on some campuses is called "a Coordinator of Religious Activities." I would like to ask, maybe of the entire panel, to give me a brief statement on what they think of that idea of a state university employing a person, out of state funds, to help off-campus chaplains, or to work with religious workers off-campus.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: In the order in which we spoke, or the order in which we are sitting?

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: Do you want to direct this to any one in particular?

DEAN OGLESBY: The reason I ask this question of all the members of the panel is that I have a feeling it may differ in the various groups. For instance, I can see the Catholics, in our situation, not using it at all. They just do not use it. I believe our Jewish rabbi, who is a warm personal friend, is opposed to it; with the Protestants joining in. I wonder if this is a typical situation?

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: I would say, my general reaction, and most Catholic chaplains' general reaction, would be not to like the term "University Chaplain," particularly at a state university. I mean, if it is a denominational university that is obviously a very, very, very different thing. But I think you break down the possibility of the kind of cooperation you might want just by calling him the university chaplain. Presumably it gives him a status and, obviously, in the context, he is a Protestant university chaplain.

I think there has been a great improvement across the country in facing the fact of religious pluralism in America; but I think this is one type of situation that does not do that, and I know of very few places where there is a religious coordinator on campus -- as I say, so often working out of the dean's office -- that the Catholic chaplain, for example, is not very, very happy to work with him. But I think you draw back just a little bit when he is, first of all, the university chaplain and then, you know, would like to, on the side, help coordinate and represent the university to the other religious groups.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: I think the university takes seriously the religious situation on its campus when it appoints a coordinator; however, his role is a difficult one to define. In many institutions it may be a chaplain who doubles as the coordinator. It may be a faculty member of the religion

department who may act as the coordinator. It may, in some institutions, be a layman who facilitates the convening of the religious bodies on the campus. If the role is regarded as an enabling role, a role which brings together the various factions or segments of the religious life of the institution, for a common purpose, that of enhancing the university life, I think it is acting with integrity. But we cannot presume to have the university sponsor a particular form of religion peculiar to the orders of the coordinator's own religious persuasion. And at this point I think we would take offense and would respond accordingly.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: Ben, do you have any comment to make?

RABBI KAHN: Yes, I shall associate myself with Father Albright's position without any hesitancy whatsoever. I think the use of the term "Coordinator of Religious Activities" is usually a subterfuge to avoid the imputation that the university is actually appointing a chaplain. But in the minds of the people, of the students certainly, a Coordinator of Religious Activities is the officially appointed individual who is to be the supervisor of the religious program and the line of authority between the religious worker and the university administration.

I see no objection to having cooperation among religious groups on the campus, but I think that the religious groups have the obligation to establish this pattern of cooperation themselves, without utilizing the facilities of the university, through its personnel to achieve and facilitate such cooperation. Now again, I will make the distinction and repeat the distinction that Father Albright made, that a church-related college is in a totally different situation. I think we have a right to direct this comment -- at least I have -- only to state universities where the problem of identification of the pattern of religious experience on the campus through an officially designated person raises some very serious doubts about the constitutionality and the propriety of such appointment.

Let me point out, for example, I know of no university anywhere in the country where the Coordinator of Religious Activities, or the Chaplain, is other than a Protestant. Am I correct in this, or am I wrong?

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: I know one Associate Director who is a Catholic now.

RABBI KAHN: Well, the fact that there is a tendency to appoint an assistant or an associate director who comes from another religion is a problem inherent in the appointment of a chaplain. In the minds of the community, and the faculty and community in general, a chaplain who has a particular orientation -- and I hope he would have one -- is identified as the symbol of the university and that makes it necessary to counterbalance that impression by the appointment of others.

Now, of course, some have proposed -- and this is the Brandeis University plan -- that there be three official chaplains of a university -- which eliminates one problem but raises another one. (Laughter)

DEAN OGLESBY: It triples. (Laughter)

DEAN WILLIAM G. LONG (University of North Carolina): I was wondering, what is the reaction of the national offices to the suggestion of the state institution that the official who coordinates, or is the liaison figure between the chaplains and the university, what is your reaction to the suggestion that this person serve in an ex-officio capacity, or at least is informed when new personnel is appointed to work on his campus? Do you think the university has any right to at least be fairly intimately involved in the appointment of the person who is going to work with them? We assume responsibility for these students in every other way. This is obviously a loaded question. I think that it would be nice, and I know in some places it does obtain that when various groups select chaplains the university is apprised of what is going on, and sometimes these people serve in an ex-officio, non-voting capacity. What is your reaction to this? Is this an encroachment of the state on the rights of the church?

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: I would not feel that it was myself. First of all, within your university life, it seems to me that the university cannot ignore religion and religious activities. Obviously, there are ways in which they cannot get formally involved in them, particularly your publicly supported universities.

I am not sure whether the rabbi completely understood my remark before. I was objecting to calling this person a university chaplain and, in that sense, making him the official chaplain of the university. For the university to have a coordinator --

RABBI KAHN: I may have misunderstood, but I agreed. (Laughter)

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: Yes, but I would not object certainly to the university having a coordinator for religious affairs. It is just simply recognizing the fact that there are groups of students who are organized around a religious focus, that they are working within the confines, if you will, of university life; and for the university to take that kind of recognition of a fact does not seem to me to involve any problems of separation of church and state. Just simply recognizing one of the facts of life, and working with it. In a case like that I certainly would see no objection at all. As a matter of fact, I know that a number of the bishops around the country, when they make a change of appointment of a Catholic chaplain, notify someone at the university. It may be the president of the university; it may be the dean; or it might be someone else, depending on the circumstances, if some

office had been set up that they would like this information to come to.

RABBI KAHN: Mr. Long, were you asking that question as to whether we should invite the university administration to confirm our appointments?

DEAN LONG: No.

RABBI KAHN: Or to approve our appointments? Which was your question?

DEAN LONG: I was asking if you felt it would be an infringement upon your rights, or a violation of separation of church and state -- I am speaking now from the state institution standpoint -- well, this is really directed more at Protestants because Protestants have groups of people who sit in a local situation and bring people down to interview and so forth. For example, at Chapel Hill there is no coordinator. I am the person who works with the chaplains. I have no title in this area. When the Presbyterians were thinking of bringing a man down next year, he came and talked with me, and this was a way of my being brought more personally in touch with the situation than I otherwise would have been, and I felt that this was a good move on their part. It is not that you confirm; it is just that you know.

RABBI KAHN: Oh, yes.

DEAN OGLESBY: I think the Catholics are to be commended on that. I think the Protestants will employ new people without the new people making an appearance on the campus until sometime after he is well in the job.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: I wouldn't say this is universal, but it is certainly becoming more and more prevalent around the country.

DEAN OGLESBY: He will call and let me know who he is, which I think is very nice.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: We have been making some studies in this area recently, for no other group other than the Protestants require this coordination perhaps as much, comparatively speaking. When you take a situation like Penn State, you know, where there are about 17 so-called Protestant bodies represented, it is awfully difficult to know who represents who, and who speaks for who. The same suggestion has been made to the university and has been made to the Protestant body, that perhaps in a multiple staff situation, where the major faiths are represented, that the staff themselves could very well make their own selection of a chairman of the staff who can act in the capacity of a coordinator for some limited time -- say a period of three years. The difficulty, of course, with this particular formula or procedure is that there may not be continuity here, not knowing when the clergy

may be transferred to other situations.

Another question you raised here, I would question here and ask other opinions of the panelists as to whether such a coordinator's office should be allied to the student services office.

MR. MAGUIRE: Isn't it the person --

DEAN LONG: What else would it be allied to, that's what I'd like to know? (Laughter)

MR. MAGUIRE: The person who functions as a coordinator is really handling the problems which once the college president had to handle in this area, isn't this true? That is, a religious group was wanting to be established near the campus, and they used to go to the president's office and talk with him about being established, about whether there would be facilities which they could use, about where they could locate, about what the plans for expansion of the college were, and how the plans of the particular religious body might relate to these. The president's job has just gotten a little too complicated, so he has designated somebody through the dean of students' office. I wonder, if the man really performs a function of coordination and liaison, isn't it all right? Doesn't the problem come if he moves into the problem of developing program? Then this becomes more complicated.

DEAN STUART GOOD (Cornell College): Some of the health services are appended, in a sense, to the dean of students' office, yet certainly the dean of students does not necessarily run the health service; but there is this sort of alignment for administrative reasons.

MR. MAGUIRE: Yes.

VICE PRESIDENT HAROLD E. STEWART: May I take one point of view on the question raised by Mr. Nakajima. At our school, at least, I think there is one good reason for the tying-in through the dean of students' staff. We do not recognize churches. We recognize student religious organizations, and they have to function under the same kinds of rules and regulations, and within the same kind of framework as any other student organization. So that if a student religious organization wishes to be a part of the university, it is a part of the student activities program in the same way as the geography club, or the French club, or the sailing club, or what have you. This is all part of the dean of students' domain -- at least at our school.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: What is the status of the so-called religious agencies which are allied to Wayne State? How are they accepted into the academic community?

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: There is a Council of Religious Advisers for each of these religious groups that meets with

the coordinator.

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: We have a Council of Religious Organizations. This is made up of the student representatives coordinating the work at the student level. And as Father Albright has said, we also have a Council of Religious Advisers, made up of the campus advisers, or chaplains, of the various groups. These two groups work more or less together; and our -- we call him -- Counselor for Religious Activities works for both.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: Which is the policy making body?

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: Policy making for what?

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: Well, to use the term loosely, the religious policy of the university is determined by which particular group?

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: The religious policy of the university is determined by the president and the Board of Governors. Recommendations may come up from the Council of Religious Advisers, or from the Council of Religious Organizations, or from both, or through my office, or from my office, up the line; but each organization works out its own program. However, all of the groups -- and there are, I think, some 15 -- cooperate together to put on certain programs, as a group of religious organizations.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: Yes.

DEAN ADOLPH T. BRUGGER (U.C.L.A.): I would like to address my question to Father Albright. I wonder whether there is any national policy on the part of the Paulist Fathers, Newman Centers, which precludes or discourages inter-faith efforts in terms of cooperation, joint ventures, or cooperative dealings with the university administration?

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: It would be to encourage cooperation on both levels, wherever this is consistent with Catholic doctrine; and with the university administration, I see no problem at all, and there have been really no practical problems, particularly in the past few years. We have worked out pretty well which areas we can cooperate with the other religious groups on campus. I was sure what was coming as soon as you stood up. Might I say that you have -- how should I word this? -- that you have experienced a particular brand of Paulist individuality that is not necessarily approved by the rest of the Paulist Fathers, and certainly is not encouraged by the Association of Newman Club Chaplains either. The Newman Chaplains Association, as a matter of fact, and certainly the Paulists as a part of that, have done everything they could to encourage, first of all, cooperation with the university, and in any area that this is possible, and concomitantly with that the cooperation that we can have with other religious bodies working on the campus too.

VICE PRESIDENT VICTOR R. YANITELLI: May I throw in a little parenthetical remark? I have done quite a bit of work with the National Conference of Christians and Jews in New York City and working with some of the rather intelligent people who are in this central headquarters of that organization, we have discussed the matter that in certain parts of the United States they move in with relative freedom, with great ease and with a certain amount of welcome, and in other parts of the United States, other diocese, they are either coldly received or not received at all. They way they have faced up to the question has been simply to treat it on a local level. Do what you can do in the areas where you can do it, and pray that it will change.

DEAN WILLIAM L. QUAY (Lehigh University): I would like to direct a question to everybody on the panel, and I would like to ask specifically what is the intellectual content of the program of your particular religious organizations? I think probably the Newmanists at least have a premium on a name as far as its intellectual appeal is concerned (laughter); although I might also say that one of our very, very bright students at Lehigh, who was an active member of the Newman Club -- in fact he was President last year -- indicated to me that he thought Newman was a bishop from Philadelphia. (Laughter)

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: He was. It was spelled a little bit differently. (Laughter) That merely shows that he was from Pennsylvania. (Laughter) I am sure that since you mentioned the Newman Club that it will be all right if I take the liberty of answering first here; but I am sure that at least one part of my answer is going to be the same for everyone. That is: You just simply cannot make a general statement because it is going to depend so much upon the local situation.

There are certainly some of our Newman Centers around the country that are offering a very, very high level of intellectual programs. There are others where it is almost nonexistent. I would say, however, that as far as we have any ability to encourage it on a national level we are at least aiming for that higher thing, and trying to get people to take Newman a little bit more seriously other than to just use his name, as some people have said, in vain. But it does just vary so much, it is difficult to make a generalization. But I would say that insofar as there has been a trend, it has certainly been to deepen the intellectual and cultural programs that are being offered by Newman Centers throughout the country; and in many ways, a cooperative effort on the part of the Newman Center in certain areas with the university itself.

For example, the Newman Center at the University of New Mexico about three years ago, in cooperation with the university, held a three day symposium on the relationship between science and religion, inviting the outstanding scholars in the field of science, as well as outstanding persons in the

field of theology and religion. This was almost unique at that time, but certainly it is the beginning of things that many other places are trying to do as they gain in personnel and facilities and so forth to be able to manage something like that.

RABBI KAHN: The profession of a Hillel Director is a specialized branch of the American rabbinate -- I should say the rabbinate generally, because we serve universities in six continents, inclusive of the Western Hemisphere. What makes it a specialized branch is not only the fact that the man works on the university campus, but he must have certain academic prerequisites before he can become associated with us. Rabbinic ordination is not ipso facto a guarantee of the man's intellectual competence for functioning in an academic atmosphere. So we have certain selective processes that we institute whereby we try to insure that a man who is put onto a campus is one who can fit into the environment of a university. I will draw a distinction between a fulltime Hillel Director and our parttime men who may be rabbis of neighboring congregations. A parttime man may be a member of the faculty who is an adviser, or a counselor in smaller units. I will speak only, because this is the ideal of our operation, of a fulltime director and a fulltime foundation.

In addition to religious services, he is a teacher. He must -- and here, Father Albright, we are in a little better position than you because we can make requirements of our men. We have a national relationship that permits us to set standards and minimal goals that our men have to conform with as, for example, in the following areas: He must conduct courses. He must teach. Sometimes he teaches on the faculty. Sometimes he teaches non-credit courses within the Hillel Foundation in Hebrew language, Jewish history, contemporary Jewish thought, medieval Jewish philosophy; he might institute a course on Jewish studies, which is a three or four hour course on Jewish study. Even though it is on a non-credit and on a voluntary basis, he must teach.

We expand the educational process in this area too to inter-collegiate activities, or regional institutes. Our summer institute, for example, at the end of the summer, we bring together 200 students from colleges all over the United States, and it is a study session for students, where they study together and learn by listening to lectures and have workshops, not in programming, but in understanding the basic presuppositions of modern Judaism, which is a philosophy underlying the Hillel program. I speak now, I suppose, for all religious groups when I say if we cannot function as groups on an intellectual par on the university level then we have no right to be there.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: I do not know what your assumption is, but I believe there is a subtle indication here that there is a dichotomy between intellect and faith, or that there exists an antithesis here between faith and reason.



DEAN QUAY: I do not think they contradict each other, but go ahead.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: No. As far as we are concerned, to be sure, we have gone through this particular period where this has been a constant struggle in our mind to equate both on the same level; but there exists today a general agreement they are not in antithesis, that the dialogue must be carried on between these two realms which are not in antithesis or not in opposition to each other but within the same discipline of life. Students' ideas about biology, astronomy, and sciences, as well as their understanding of sex, love, and sports, will change and alter in the course of their college years. I don't think religion should be apart from it. This too needs to be looked at carefully and re-examined with a critical inquiry.

I think we have also gone to the day when we no longer regard the student fellowship as just a coke and caper club, or an extension of the church Sunday school, and that we must take the university seriously and engage in this dialogue between faith and the various disciplines. We are here now to study programs mainly encountering faith and reason together.

DEAN QUAY: From the national offices of your three organizations, which are represented here, there has never been, I do not believe, any kind of coordinated effort at least to try to sell the idea to state universities, or to private universities, that what is needed is some kind of academic appreciation of the classical theologies of the Judeo-Christian tradition. I do not know whether you are familiar with Bernard Beal and some of the things that he said and wrote about, but he goes into great detail in his book *Crisis in Education*, in which he discusses the whole realm of religion in higher education, which had become pretty much of a farce when he was describing it at a big state university when he was invited to give a series of lectures on that very topic. We seem to be so much afraid, you know, that religion is something outside the classroom, that you cannot have any kind of exposition of classical, theological ideas in the Judeo-Christian tradition, and that we say, "No. Everybody believes the way he wants to believe and, therefore, we cannot give any official sanction." But it seems to me that religion as an intellectual discipline, namely, in its theological implications, can be taught and discussed. I wonder if your organizations are doing anything in this area?

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: Might I just make one remark to that? I would say that our cooperative efforts on that level have been through the non-denominational religious, educational associations which have sponsored a number of conferences. The most recent was in conjunction with the University of Michigan, The Conference on Religion in the State University. Certainly, the points that you have raised were stated with a good deal of vigor and directness during this conference, at which

every effort was made to get as many representative universities' personnel there as possible to get across at least to discuss this idea.

MR. MAGUIRE: Actually, there is a good deal of movement in terms of major, even public, universities employing people in the field of religion too, isn't there? I was a little concerned that there was an underlying assumption of separation of the academic, of the mind, from the rest of life implied in your comment, and I think that Mr. Nakajima's response would be comparable to mine: that students are decision-making persons on a whole range of things, but obviously, the critical capacities of the mind need to be brought to these. I think all of us, maybe with the possible exception of the rabbi, who has more authority over local units than is true of any of the rest --

RABBI KAHN: I wish I could quote you. (Laughter)

MR. MAGUIRE: I thought I was quoting you out of our dinner conversation.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: Comparatively, yes.

MR. MAGUIRE: We recognize the variation in quality, as Father Albright has said, depending on the qualifications of the particular persons in the situation. Our Student YMCA and YWCA certainly seek to deal with some of the issues in faith, and life, and deal with these in our publications. The current issue of The Collegian, for instance, has a very interesting debate, or kind of debate, on "Who Is The Responsible Student?" with Bishop Stephen Neil taking the position that the responsible student is the one who studies and does not get involved in freedom rides and all that, as he says. And there is a response by President James Dixon of Antioch on combining education and action. This is the kind of leadership which we seek to bring to the platform in our major conferences, our national student assembly, where we will have Bill Coffin, the Chaplain at Yale, where we will have Buell Gallagher, and Carl Rowan. We have a conditional word of interest from the Secretary General of the United Nations. We will have seminars in which we have people who are seeking to live out their vocation in life situations. We will have John Brademas from the Congress, and Mr. Frank Cassell, who is Director of Personnel Relations for Inland Steel.

This drive in our movement at the present time to find people who are in some frontier situation in the structures of society and working out their vocation in these situations, now this is life. I think it is not apart from the mind. It is the mind applied critically and constructively in a particular situation where life is lived.

MRS. NORTON: I was going to respond briefly to the question by saying that we had some tapes made of student discussions across the country, in about 10 or 12 different

university settings. These student discussions arose through the fact that theology per se was not somehow reaching them or speaking in terms of the relevancy of the life situation. We are not saying it shouldn't. It should. But to put the student in the situation in which the student asks the question, in which then there is relevancy in the answer, is the way in which we have to go at this business. So it is not always the declaration which reaches the student in an educational process. In other words, there are other parts of the educational process which makes the difference, in terms of the students, and it is a part of this group that we have been trying to gear the program which comes out of the students' goals themselves and, therefore, they ask it, and then receive it.

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD (Northwestern University): I would just like to ask a question of all of the group: If in recent years they have sensed an increasing involvement of not just student programs on the university campuses, but isn't it encouraging to some of you, at least, that the university is becoming more and more the university in the involvement of faculty and staff within the programs of the various groups? I certainly know that we don't call ours a Newman Club, Father; we call it the Shield Club, as you understand, at Northwestern; but the involvement of faculty has been an interesting fact there, bringing faculty into the picture and giving the student the opportunity to probe and occasionally confront this man who commands them in a classroom, from a podium, where they are not always free in a large class to ask questions, confronting him with the questions they have always wanted to ask him when he was lecturing.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: That has certainly been true on our part. I mean, for years, there has been an official faculty adviser to a Newman Club. That has been a very standard procedure. We even have a few colleges where they have not been Catholics because there has not been a Catholic on the faculty. It has been a sympathetic non-Catholic, I am sure. Over the past ten years, there has been a noticeable development to get a large faculty advisory group, for example, even in an official way, to the Newman organization, and then going beyond that, in a very informal way, but still a directed informality, to get faculty people themselves for discussion groups, just meeting together, maybe informally together with the chaplain and other faculty advisers, to let them know what is going on in the student program and to gear other programs for the whole faculty and administration group. This has been so much so that we have a nascent National Newman Association of Faculty and Staff just started a couple of years ago.

But we certainly feel that we are not going to be able to work with the university as we should, to be as effective for our own people, or certainly to contribute what we could to the university unless we do involve the faculty. First of all, they are in the best position to speak from the university point of view. Our National Chaplain likes to say

the denizens of the jungle, they are there all the time -- even chaplains come and go. And certainly the students are there, but unless we can make rapport with them or have their constructive criticism, even of the campus churches, I do not think we are ever going to fulfill our job. So we have been making every effort to move in that direction.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: There is more openness on the part of the administration and faculty than we have evidenced in the past 10 or 15 years. I do not think this is just a popular move on the part of the personnel of the university, but a serious engagement in conversation, in dialogue with the representatives of the church, not only as churchmen, but to take their academic life seriously. A good illustration of this is at Penn State University where the National Council just conducted a one week survey, where the work among the faculty has grown to the extent that they are asking for an Executive Secretary to conduct their affairs.

MR. WILMER J. KITCHEN (Executive Secretary, World University Service): It may be that my query is not within the orbit of this discussion, which is the "New Patterns for Student Religious Groups," but it seems to me there is an important dimension that we have not brought out here, and that is: What is the responsibility of the university itself within a culture which has a religious base? There are religious values that have a relation to education. These values, in the main, are not too different from the Judeo-Christian tradition. Dr. Stoke mentioned last night a sense of judgment, of responsibility, which the university bears, faculty and students alike.

This strikes me as being a religious question and a question which will never be resolved in relation to some of the challenges of some of the scientific demands for education unless it is clearly based in our conception of universal values, which are religious. I think this discussion leaves the university off the hook far too easily. There have been some things written, in Britain particularly, about the re-examination of the presuppositions of higher education. This is the kind of thing that it seems to me are important. It is the responsibility of the university. It is, of course, also the responsibility of the religious organizations.

Is this completely out of order?

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: Oh, no, I think you put it well. This is what I think we have been trying to say in our thesis, to help the university become the university.

MR. KITCHEN: Exactly.

DEAN BRUGGER: Father Albright misinterpreted my remarks. We have the most amiable personal relations with our chaplain. Vic, when you come out to the Coast we will take you out to the ocean -- and bring you back. (Laughter) In

fact, our relations are so good that I even share Cardinal Newman's motto that every man has his doxy; but being a voucher, I don't necessarily settle for heterodoxy. (Laughter) Sorry.

In Harpers, several months ago, there was a rather provocative article which maintained the thesis -- and I blush because I have forgotten the author -- by the very rapport shown, which we are discussing tonight, by the state, or if you wish, the state institutions, and religion, religion is weakening its own cause. I am of an open mind on that point. I would very much like to know what the members of the panel feel about that thesis, or think about it.

RABBI KAHN: I will take a crack at it. I think the question you have asked is the same question that surrounds the whole issue of religion and public education in America: The degree to which the religious institutions are able to stand on their own two feet in communicating their values and doctrines to their own adherents, without having to utilize public institutions for this purpose. I am sorry that Bill Long has gone because his question is relevant too. I misunderstood his question, but the question which I misunderstood would have been relevant in the sense in which if the university has to approve of the appointment of a religious counselor, then it weakens the position of the religious groups, because the religious leader, like any individualist, has to retain his independence in a public institution in the same way as the university must retain its independence from religious pressures. It is a mutual relationship that has to be preserved; a relationship of independence, but still of cooperation.

It is one of the reasons why I do not particularly favor, as I indicated earlier, the utilization of the university facilities, such as your chaplain, to promote and to advocate religion. I think that is our job as religious teachers. This does not mean that the university cannot or should not provide opportunities for religious groups, and pastors, and student organizations to function within the university, as independent units, subject to certain regulations that you pointed out from Wayne State, which apply to any student chartered organization.

The preservation of the right of criticism by the religious group of the university policy, and of the exclusion by the university of below par or below standard attempted academic officerings by religious groups, I think are both cautions that have to be preserved on both sides.

One final observation or illustration. There will be growing courses in religion, or courses about religion given in state universities. I do not have any figures with me, but more and more are courses being taught about religions in all universities -- or at least, in most universities in America. There are very few of the larger state universities

that still have no courses about religion. But I think the university has an obligation here to preserve the academic integrity of its offerings even in the field of religion -- and I say "even," because this is a tendency of some of us who are engaged always in religious work to feel that because we are religious professionals that we are qualified ipso facto to be qualified personnel. Even if sometimes it means a personal offense to an ordained minister or rabbi or priest who is not deemed academically qualified to function as a teacher in a classroom, the university must maintain its standards.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: Let me take a crack at it from another point of view here, and I accept the responsibility for criticizing the Protestant churches, that the weakness is found in the institutional churches, which has so identified itself with the culture in the world that it has lost its own uniqueness and its sense of mission. This is reflected in the academic life as well as in the world, or in the culture.

A ramification of this institutional church life that we could spell out, but as it is related to the student life, we find them also riding the organizational escalator, and as depicted in the analysis of our Pennsylvania analyst -- who am I thinking of? "Changing Values in College." Jacobs -- that the criteria today seems to be, or the ultimate in education seems to be leisure, success, status, and I think we need to very much reflect upon these criteria and bring about a change in basic attitudes in the life of the students, as well as in the university community. To a large extent, I think the church has contributed to this attitude.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: My question may be redundant, and if so I apologize for having missed the earlier presentations, but I am lost at a very simple point to follow the fine responses given to the question of intellectual content. Would you define briefly for me what are the religious objectives of these several organizations among students?

DEAN OGLESBY: Before Glen's question, could I ask one that has to do with the discussion, otherwise I will lose a little point. Would Glen let me introduce one? It may bear on what he is saying.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: All right.

DEAN OGLESBY: I think, rabbi, there is an assumption in what you are saying -- in a way, I am defending our use of the university chaplain -- I think there is an assumption that only religion has to be institutionalized. I am not sure that all of religion, in terms of the voice that must be spoken to the whole student body and the whole faculty, can come from the various religious bodies. Do I make myself clear?

RABBI KAHN: I am not altogether sure I understand.

Do you mean that these religious bodies must function on the campus? Is that what you mean?

DEAN OGLESBY: I am saying this. In my own community there are 250 young Jewish people. The rabbi tells me that less than 50 are active in his group. I am not saying that the university itself can speak the theology of the Jewish religion, but it seems to me the university has an obligation to say something about religious values to that group of uncommitted students, even to your own young Jewish people who are not going to the synagogue or to the Hillel Foundation. In other words, their values, cultural, intellectual, and so on, are beyond what the institution does, and if the institution cannot do it that the university has an obligation.

RABBI KAHN: I do not disagree with that at all. The university is the host. The graciousness of the hospitality to the religious groups will condition student response to their particular religious identifications. I would quite agree with that. You did not mean this, of course: That the university has to become a missionary to the unaffiliated Jews. It has enough to do being a missionary to the uneducated students. (Laughter)

DEAN OGLESBY: Well, that is just exactly my point. Maybe the word "missionary" is wrong. You do not think there should be any religious voice spoken to the unaffiliated Jews except the voice of the synagogue and the rabbi?

RABBI KAHN: I do not think the university officials should consider it their responsibility to the unaffiliated Jewish students to encourage them to affiliate formally. I think when the university presents at the opening of the year, for example --

DEAN OGLESBY: I didn't mean that.

RABBI KAHN: I guess I am just not following you.

DEAN OGLESBY: I am talking about the word "religion" and the values that are inherent therein, the whole idea of religion, something deeper, maybe, than a pure institutionalization of it. I am talking about the value of paying out of the university funds for the chaplain, and the value it has to the young Jewish people, committed or uncommitted.

RABBI KAHN: I certainly agree with you. I would go a step further, as I intimated earlier, and personally encourage universities to make it possible for Departments of Religion to be introduced into their normal offerings, preserving the academic integrity of the department as they would any other department. And when religion has itself recognized as an academic discipline, then the whole attitude of students similarly is conditioned favorably.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: I am still left with my question. The student organizations are not the church. What then are the religious objectives of the student foundations, these organizations among students?

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: I will be glad to start off, Dean Nygreen. First of all, as far as we are concerned, the student organization, as such, is not the total, if you will, of the human apostolate. I mean, it is a valuable vehicle through which we reach the students, for one. It is a valuable means whereby we can develop lay leadership in a, if you will, supernatural, a religious framework, and context and so forth. But, I mean, the church would certainly feel that it has a goal for the student on the campus, the same goal that she has for any other Catholic; namely, to lead that student through the church's sacraments, through the church's worship, and through the church's teachings, to that union with God that is necessary in order to attain salvation.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Well, this is very helpful. Would you say, Father Albright, that the Newman Club is the church for the Catholic student while he is a student?

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: To a certain extent, yes. I would say that the particular thing about this is that these particular individuals that the church is trying to do for, that she is trying to do for everyone else, are students; they are in an academic setting and, therefore, we are not going to reach them.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: All right. I understand this. But I think this is different, or at least I suspect this is different from what I will hear from one or two of the others. And it is this difference in perception of the activities in a religious role that I am really trying to get at for my own understanding. That is very helpful.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: May I make one other distinction here, that I am not sure you have caught here, Dean. I would say that it is the role of the Catholic center, which in a sense is off-campus, which has this total thing; and in so far as the student organization is a university organization, it is not the church on campus, then, in quite that same sense as the student center.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: I understand it is not the church on campus, but it is the church for the Catholic student while he is a student. Very good. Now, what would the rabbi say?

RABBI KAHN: Well, Hillel is not the church for the Catholic student, so that to that extent I have to disagree. (Laughter) But our role is parallel. That is, the Hillel Foundation is the religious center for the Jewish students on the campus, and we would accept, in our own context, Father



Albright's definition of some of the theological goals, or religious goals of our respective student foundations.

I am very intrigued, Dean Nygreen, when you pick up this question of the intellectual and the religious, because from the Jewish point of view study is a form of worship, and there is a religious obligation to be an educated and a learned individual. And as such, the educative process is religious experience within our framework. And I will add something that you may be waiting for a chance to say; namely, that there are other implications of religious teaching which have to do with personal development, with social responsibility, with integration into the total university, of discourse of all people, all races, all religious traditions, and so on. I think you can put all of these together and, I think, provide a pretty good rationale for our existence.

DEAN GOOD: Then our religious activity is really extracurricular. We consider on-campus religious activities of this kind as being part of the extracurricular program. What I am thinking of is what Glen said now, and church is not an extracurricular activity. There is a hairline thought here, but it struck me that Glen was pointing out Father Albright's distinction of the church for the students in residence on the campus, and to me church is not an extracurricular activity. It is part of one's life. Yet we call these extracurricular activities.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: I would like to hear Mr. Nakajima on this point.

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: I think much depends on our understanding and interpretation of the theology of the church, and what, in our estimate, constitutes the church. Insofar as we are concerned, I take the brief statement as outlined in our pronouncement which has just come out, on the whole area of the church in higher education, as approved by our General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, which covers the entire area of our concern in higher education; that the mission of the church in the university demands more than casual concern for just another age group program in the life of the church. Its aim is not merely to conserve its youth for service in the church at some later date, but to assist them and their fellow Christians to be the church, wherever they are.

The mission of the Church of Christ is not primarily directed to itself, and to its members, but first of all to the world -- in this case, a particular part of the world. Then it goes on to clarify some of these other areas. You get the point here?

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: I think I do. And this raises some very serious questions for state university people, doesn't it?

REVEREND NAKAJIMA: We conceive of the community on

the university campus as the latent community of Christians which are the church.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Well, I was going back to the question which was being discussed earlier, as to what sort of expression of concern, as for example, coordination, you look for from the university. And I have been trying to establish a rationale in my own mind as to why the interests of the university administrator should be so different from the interests of the religious foundation workers themselves. I recognize this difference. I have lived through it with my own people. I say to them, "Would you like the university to appoint a coordinator of religious affairs?" They tell me, "No," they do not, and I try to understand how they think. And this discussion has helped me, I think, come closer to an understanding than I have ever had before.

But now this begins to raise some other questions. I see, in this sense, why you want to be so separate from the administration on campus, yet you want to feel an integral part of it, and yet you need the feeling of separateness. I begin to wonder, regarding those 50 Jewish students out of the total of 250 that Dean Oglesby referred to, who identify themselves as Jewish, who choose to identify themselves with the Hillel Foundation. The mission of the concern of the university, you have already said, is for the role of religion in the life of all of these young people, and yet how do we function in this relationship? Administratively, the president does not want to be seeing, as at Penn State, 17 representatives, each coming in thinking he has a private avenue to the president's ear and can get a little more than the other. He wants to deal through some one person, preferably some one person on his staff. And now here are all these questions all bound into one.

Where goes the skeptic? Where goes the person who says, "Yes, I am Jewish, but while I am in college I want" -- and he defines something else. I use this, Rabbi Kahn, because this was the illustration that Ross Oglesby used. I am beginning to wonder if the YMCA and the YWCA has not carved out for itself a very particular kind of role. And then I am led to ask not Mr. Maguire what he sees this role to be, but rather to ask you other gentlemen what you see this role to be.

MR. MAGUIRE: Let me say, before they speak -- give them a chance to decide what they are going to say -- that we are in the midst of carving the document which I said was an in-the-family document, but which you have in your hands, which reveals some of the effort to carve out this question as the YMCA -- and at this point, Margaret may want to comment in a slightly different way for the YWCA -- the way in which the YMCA is dealing with this question of being a movement which clearly stands in the tradition of Protestant Christianity and yet which, beginning as it does with students where

they are in their search for meaning, in their desire to explore a variety of issues to confront the relevance of the Christian faith, and other faiths, and the way in which the association identifies with them in this search, with somehow a confidence that God makes Himself known to them in the search, and as they wrestle with not only the questions of philosophy and theology, but the questions that are decisions and issues in their lives, this is the reason that we have moved away from the identification which we carried 10, 15 years ago with the Protestant church-student groups, and this is the thing which we seek to do.

I am sure that our friends, if they are candid here, and I hope they will be, will not all look, if any of them do, with favor upon this role of the association, which is as I indicated in my initial statement, I think, identified somewhere between the faiths of the churches and the synagogues, on the one hand, and the role which college administrators play on the other, or the universities play on the other. Whether we are going to be able to walk this road, helping students, on the one hand, be freed to appropriate the truth of the university, and freed to appropriate the faith or a faith of the church or synagogue remains to be seen. But there are students who are at the point of search who seem to respond to this kind of an approach.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: Dean, I am still not sure that I have your problem clearly in mind.

CONFERENCE DIRECTOR NYGREEN: I have about three problems in mind at once. Well, one problem, obviously, is that if what you wish to be is the church among students, if I understand this, this dictates then that you are off the campus -- speaking from the posture of the state university now.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: Yes.

CONFERENCE DIRECTOR NYGREEN: The Newman Foundation, the Hillel Foundation, and the Westminster Foundation must be off the campus physically. They must employ their own staff, pay their salaries, and insofar as the students they serve choose to form an organization, well and good, to be recognized, as Dean Stewart suggests, but that is extraneous really to the mission of the Newman Club. You see the distinction here? Mr. Good's comment that we tend to see religion as an extracurricular activity -- this is the student organization thing, isn't it? But you are saying the student organization is not the Newman Club. The Newman Club is the expression of the Roman Catholic Church for the religious life of students while they are away from their home parishes on the campus.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: No, I would say that the Newman Club is the student organization but that, in a sense, the institutionalization of the church toward the campus is not conterminous with the Newman Club.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: This is what I am saying.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: Yes.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Okay. So there are two completely separate interests here.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: But they are not completely separate because they are made up of the same people who are, if you will, citizens of the university world. I mean, you cannot completely separate, if you will, their religious life, and their intellectual life, and their extracurricular life, whatever terms you want to use. I mean, if the student is going to practice his religion and grow and develop religiously within the university community, certainly the institutionalization of the university is going to have its affect on him.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: All of this is fine, except this: You do not wish to take any responsibility, Father Albright, when you are the Newman Club Chaplain for what is said by a professor of psychology in his classroom; but neither does the university faculty want to take any responsibility for what you say to the members of the Newman Club when you are functioning as a Newman Club Chaplain, an employee of the church. These are two separate and distinct roles.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: All right, that is fine.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: In both these cases we are dealing with the same population of students. At this point you say they are joined. Yes, but the responsibility for you and what you say, and the exercise of your religious and teaching functions is the responsibility of the church. The state university does not enter into this. You have complete freedom. So too does the faculty have complete freedom from the church.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: All right.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Students are the pawns.

REVEREND ALBRIGHT: They are the pawns, but my point here, and this is where the administration specifically of the university seems to come in, that in terms of the institutionalized life of this particular person right now, it is really directed by the university. The university says the classes meet at a certain time, you do this at another time, and so forth and so on. You would theoretically, you might say, be in a position that suppose there were some conflict and opposition between the ideas that are freely expressed by the professor in his classroom and an idea that I might wish to freely expound at the Newman Center. You have an edge over the student because he has to go to the classroom, in a sense,

in a way that he does not have to come to the student center. So it certainly seems to me that the administration of the university should be, at least, concerned so that the student has an opportunity to get down to the student center, to the Catholic center.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Of course, I buy this, and I merely bring this up in order to say, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me there is an area here in which an organization like the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators could work with these gentlemen to find a way of delineating this relationship between the religious role and the administrative role in order to facilitate the functioning of both. And I think this statement needs to be made. It is difficult for any representative of any one religious community to make it, and I think in cooperation we might all arrive at a statement which we understand that could be helpful to administrations just trying to find their way in this area. That is the point to the comment, and I think I ought to stop at this point.

CHAIRMAN GLUCK: We have now reached the point of ten-twenty-five, believe it or not, and I don't know about the rest of you, but this has been very helpful to me. I have one question which I do not want to get them started on, but I am going to ask myself this question. I heard in a meeting last fall, in Kansas City, from a man I met who said to me, "You know, I'm not an ordained clergyman; I am a teacher; but I would like to be a coordinator, just to be purely the handmaiden." He said, "I know nothing about theology, but I would just like to help all of these pastors."

I thought this was a very interesting thing. He did not propose to me that he had ordination. I had often thought of a coordinator in a university or college to be an ordained person of something; but here was a man, mind you -- I don't know how good he was, but he proposed only to be helpful in simply helping in the total spectrum of getting the job done, and to be a kind of interpreter between the administration and the student pastors. Some day I want to find out, and I am going to watch him, and see if in three or four years he really gets a place to try to do this. I'll let you all know.

I hope this has been as helpful to you all as it has been to me. I want to be one of the members of this Conference to thank each one of you four men, and you, ma'am, for being here to share with us. We are getting a transcription of this, as you know, and if you get questions from the deans later by letter, you will know it comes out of these minutes.

Does anyone else have a good word for the meeting before we adjourn? (Applause) Thank you.

... The Seminar adjourned at ten-thirty o'clock ...

## SECOND BUSINESS SESSION

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

The Conference reconvened at nine-ten o'clock,  
President Weaver presiding.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: May I have your attention please. You might be interested in hearing a little bit about our discussion that has been going on up here at the head table. It has to do with how to get the Delegates to this Conference to come to the business sessions early in the morning. "Shorty" and I have been involved in a rather high level, abstract discussion of not only how you get them in here, but of whether if they do not come we should worry about it. Jack Clevenger gave me a pretty serious nudge that I ought to get this meeting started, and so I asked Jack if he could go out and get some people to come in so we would have a good reason for getting it started.

From that point we moved in further negotiations with "Shorty," and I said, "Shorty, I have one idea -- the only one I have ever had about how to get the people started in a nine o'clock meeting in the morning, and that is for you to come up here and get started talking, and word will get around that you are up here talking, and I don't know anything more likely to attract an audience." (Laughter and applause)

Now, will some of the people near the door please spread the word that "Shorty" Nowotny is on the platform, carte blanche, no holds barred, indeed, encouraged to take all the liberties that he can imagine he should. The only request I have is that the people who come in spread the word that "Shorty" is on. "Shorty," you're on.

DEAN ARNO "SHORTY" NOWOTNY (University of Texas): The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina asked me if our Committee was ready. The Committee he had reference to -- I can filibuster here --

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Wait a minute, "Shorty." You mustn't make that Committee report now.

DEAN NOWOTNY: No, sir, but I'm going to tell them what I told you. The Committee that is supposed to report this morning is one of 15 others, and that is the Committee on Nominations and Place. If you will look at your little orange book (laughter), we have a Committee, and we have met, and we is ready. The Committee on Nominations and Place, page 16. When Fred asked me if our Committee was ready, I said, that I'm sort of like the colored gentleman from South Texas who got a long questionnaire from the draft board asking a lot of questions. He hadn't had very much reading, and very little writing, so he just wrote across the face of this long questionnaire, "Dear Draft Board, when you is ready, I is." So that's what I told Fred this morning, that we were ready to

report. (Laughter) I could filibuster by reading the names of who are here and registered (laughter) and start calling the roll (laughter) and threaten to cut the expense accounts of people who are absent, and let the presidents know who didn't attend these meetings. That would be good. We can have a roll call of the business session. (Laughter)

You know, I've been worried about this program of the Peace Corps, and I am glad that Joe Kauffman is here. Les Rollins told this story, which is not very kind, but I'll tell it, on the Peace Corps. These three cannibals in the Katanga Province were talking. One of them said, "Have you met any boys from the Peace Corps?" One of them said, "Yes." He said, "Well, how do you like these Harvard boys?" He said, "They're tough. They don't eat well." He said, "How about the Yale boys?" He said, "They're also tough." So he said, "Did anyone of you ever eat one of these Texas longhorns?" He said, "Man, these Texas longhorns -- did you ever try to clean one?" (Laughter) That's the story that Les told.

I've been worried about this program. We've a lot of professors -- professors of economics, professors of social work. I'm going to say to the next year's Program Chairman, O. D. Roberts -- I hope he is here -- we have some professors, and we have a professor of European history. He did a lot of research, and they have discovered that Joan of Arc's final words were, "I'm smoking more but enjoying it less." (Laughter) I think it would be good to put this boy on the program. (Laughter) We have a psychology department doing research. You heard about Sam, the space monkey. Are they coming in, Fred? (Laughter)

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Yes. They said they would stop breakfast if they got the word. (Laughter)

DEAN NOWOTNY: Anyway, this psychology department got Sam the space monkey, and Sam is the one who went around ahead of Colonel Glenn. Last week they found Sam coming out of our library. He had one book under his arm, Darwin's "Origin of the Species," and under the other arm was the bible. One of our psychology professors said, "Sam, what gives here?" He said, "I'm trying to find out if I'm my brother's keeper or my keeper's brother." (Laughter) I think we can have Sam the space monkey on the program next year at Northwestern with great profit to everyone. (Laughter)

Fred, I'm still filibustering. Do you want me to read anything else?

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Don't take more than 30 more minutes. (Laughter)

DEAN NOWOTNY: How many reports do we have to have this morning?

PRESIDENT WEAVER: I think we can go on "Shorty," any

time you are ready.

DEAN NOWOTNY: Yes. I told you gentlemen that on page 16 --

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Not with your report though. That report comes later. We want your report last. We are ready to start with some others when you are ready to yield the floor.

DEAN NOWOTNY: I will yield the floor, sir. I hope that got around. I'll be back. (Laughter and applause)

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Thank you, "Shorty," very much. I passed the word that "Shorty" was talking. I think the people will be hearing that "Shorty" is aboard and they will come up here and see me aboard and they will leave, so I'll get on in a hurry. We will go on now with the regular reports of Committees and Commissions, and I will ask Juan Reid to come forward and preside while we hear from the Committees.

... Vice President Juan Reid assumed the Chair ...

CHAIRMAN REID: This morning we have three Committee reports. I am sure they are all fairly brief. The first one of these is the Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations and Bill Toombs, who is the Vice-Chairman of this Committee, will make the report at this time. Bill.

DEAN WILLIAM E. TOOMBS (Drexel Institute of Technology, Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations): Thank you, Juan. I will get out of the way quickly so we can get "Shorty" back here. I have been Vice-Chairman of this Committee for about two weeks, so I know pretty much about what has been going on, and I can only say, to begin with, that so far as the Committee on Cooperation with the National Student Organizations is concerned, we need it.

I received a letter from the National Student Association the other day addressed to "The Dean of Mean," and I think that this is a typographical error, which may have some other implications. (Laughter)

The report of this Committee is going to be one of the most brief that will be presented to this gathering. It is drawn from the experience of the Chairman, Ray Hawk, who was unable to be here, and from the Committee discussions held over the past few days. We have been fortunate to have with us as guests representatives of two organizations which have worked with students for many years who have found it possible to be with us. Wilmer Kitchen, of the World University Service, and Margaret Norton, of the YWCA, have attended most of the sessions.

We have a statement, two questions, and a recommendation. First, the statement of what has been done. In compliance with a suggestion made last year, representatives of NASPA

- 146 -



have been asked to attend the nearby meetings of national organizations, and to submit a brief report of the proceedings of these meetings. Ted Zillman did exactly this with the NSA Conference, the NSA Congress last year. The question now arises as to how this material may be made available to members, how it shall be retained, and this is still under consideration.

The second question arises rather early in considering the work of this Committee. Toward which national student organization should the Committee direct its attention? The National Student Association is a pretty clear cut case, but what other organizations do NASPA members have an interest in? The list becomes very, very long, and the alphabet and the permutations and combinations are used up pretty quickly. I have had a happy thought this past year that sooner or later we are going to run out of these combinations, and I want to report to you there are certain clues that this is happening. We had a visitor from UNESCO recruiting on the campus. He happened to be a very British brigadier, and he said he was traveling under the auspices of the AID, formerly the ICA, and this gave him a few moments of discomfort because in England AID was stamped on birth certificates and stood for artificial insemination donor. (Laughter) So we are running out of combinations. (Laughter)

In addition to these two questions which the Committee will continue to work with, there is one recommendation, and this we prepared at yesterday's meeting. It is recommended that the Executive Committee authorize the preparation and publication of an informational list of those national organizations which direct a substantial portion of their program toward the undergraduate students. We do not know how many this will include, or precisely what the list will comprise, but it is a beginning.

I think a few corollaries are in order on this recommendation. First of all, the list would not duplicate Beard's Manual, or the list of honoraries, or the list of publications which provide adequate coverage of student groups. It would be prepared principally to fill in the gaps and supplement the presently published material.

How would it be prepared? Well, there are some possibilities of doing this by research through a graduate student researching first the published material and then going through directories of student organizations that might be available through campus records. We do not have in mind a questionnaire, you will be happy to learn. This would be the last resort. The first efforts would be exploratory, and by next year we would know whether some kind of a formal publication was desirable.

The way this came about was the recognition that there are many, many organizations coming up that may appear on your campus and on mine about which students have no information,

and you and I have no information. What is more, we do not even have a place that could be contacted to give us adequate statements of what the purpose of the organization is. It was pointed out that there are some twenty-seven rightist groups presently organizing in various places, and working with undergraduate students.

The idea of a publication list was prompted by the success of the list of professional societies that was prepared under NASPA auspices a couple of years ago, or through the last two years.

There are a couple of other points that were discussed at the committee meetings, but we are not prepared to take any action or make any recommendations. One of them involved extending invitations to representatives of student organizations to attend this meeting. This can be a very worthwhile source of information for us and it can be a useful experience for the student organizations; so eventually we will get around to some criteria by which invitations can be extended.

There was also the question of whether NASPA should enter into any kind of an endorsement of the activities of various groups, but this has been put aside because it was felt that this list, or some knowledge of the kinds of organizations that are presently working with students was the fundamental step.

That completes our Committee report, with the one recommendation for action by the Executive Committee.

CHAIRMAN REID: Thank you, Bill. I can assure you that this will be presented to the Executive Committee at their next meeting.

The next Committee which will report will be that of the Committee on International Exchange of Students, and it will be given by John Netherton. By the way, I might announce that we are losing John. He has accepted a faculty appointment. In other words, he is deserting the ranks.

DEAN JOHN B. NETHERTON (Chairman, Committee on International Exchange of Students, University of Chicago): Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: It is not really desertion. Whatever it is, desertion is an unpleasant name for it, and I will have to take exception to that.

Before I read this report, I think it might be well for me to explain the motion I will make after you have heard it, about your approval or acceptance of it. It carries one recommendation which falls squarely in the province of Commission I, which Commission has not had an opportunity to discuss it. We decided that it would not be appropriate to ask this body to approve the report fully and in the sense of endorsing the recommendation until Commission I has had an opportunity to

discuss it. Commission I will meet this afternoon. Members of my Committee will go there and discuss this thing with Commission I; and then the approval of the recommendation, as such, will come before you tomorrow morning as a separate item of business. The recommendation will possibly be modified somewhat as a result of the discussions with Commission I. Meanwhile, I will have duplicated the language of the recommendation itself, and lay those sheets out in appropriate places -- I guess, over by the Registration Desk -- for anyone to pick up and look at between now and tomorrow morning, for anyone who is interested in doing so.

During the year since the 43rd Conference, the Committee's membership has been increased by new appointments, and is now composed of the deans listed on page 18 of the Conference program. We lost one member, Dean Bill Shepherd, of the University of California, through his re-transfer from deaning to the professing of speech. Four members of the Committee are in attendance at this Conference.

You will perhaps recall that in our first report, we undertook to consider the student personnel dean's responsibilities in regard to international exchange in three contexts: that of the national interest, that of the main educational purposes of his institution, and the one we called "operations and administrative organization." There have been significant developments in each of these contexts since a year ago.

On the national scene, the passage of the Fulbright-Hayes Act -- which you recall was the subject of a NASPA resolution at Colorado Springs -- will enormously strengthen and improve the federal government's direct efforts in educational and cultural exchange, as well as its support of the exchange activities of the colleges and universities. The precise forms this support will take are not yet clear, and in that fact, we believe, lies a challenge to NASPA. Whatever its forms may be, the new federal program will have an impact on most or all of our campuses which will inevitably affect the workings of the student-personnel program, whether the dean of students has direct administrative responsibility for any part of his institution's work in international education or not.

It is important to us all that these effects be consistent with the best principles of student-personnel administration. NASPA's central purpose is the formulation, study, and furtherance of those principles. Your committee suggests, therefore, that appropriate measures be taken in the next few months to make known our concern as an association with the particulars of the new national programs being planned, and our availability for consultation about them. Later in this report, we will recommend a specific first step.

Meanwhile, the Peace Corps, also blessed a year ago by resolution of this Association, has taken great and rapid strides since that time. As you know, Peace Corps officers have

been in attendance at this Conference, and there has been occasion for useful informal discussion between them and deans, particularly those of the latter who are themselves the Peace Corps liaison officers at their own institutions.

An account of last night's seminar with Director of Training, Joe Kauffman, will appear elsewhere in the Conference record. It was clear from Doctor Kauffman's presentation and the discussion that followed that there is a wide range of matters on which the Peace Corps and the student personnel administrator can be of mutual assistance. It was clear that the Peace Corps is disposed to seek and use the advice of the deans. Some of the technical problems that arise in Peace Corps College, as we were calling it last night, precisely in the field of our special competence, are so interesting in themselves that even if there were not several other good reasons for doing so, we are confident that NASPA will wish to continue the conversation begun at last night's seminar. We therefore suggest, and call this to the particular attention of the Conference Chairman, that a Peace Corps meeting be included annually from now on in NASPA's conference program.

Your Committee has no resolutions to propose on matters of national policy this year. But in line with NASPA's accepted view that one appropriate way for the Association to relate itself to the great national issue of student exchange is to encourage NASPA members to take an informed, personal interest in it, we would include here the following suggestion, if we may do so without giving offense to those members who have already read everything. The January, 1962 issue of the Student Personnel Methods Bulletin; published by the Western Personnel Institute (1136 Steuben Street, Pasadena) is entirely devoted to an excellent, annotated bibliography of recent books and articles on the subject of international education in its various ramifications. The price is one dollar. The suggestion having been made, it will not be belabored in this report.

We come now to the inter-connections between international exchange, the student-personnel administrator, and the largest purposes of his institution. Here again, we see a new challenge to the Association. The Committee on the University and World Affairs, created in 1959 by the Ford Foundation at the request of the Department of State, and chaired by Mr. J. L. Morrill, former president of the University of Minnesota, published its report shortly before the 43rd NASPA Conference. (The report is available without charge from the Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Avenue, New York 22, New York). It is a highly cogent statement of what will be needed in the near future in the way of new initiatives on the part of colleges and universities, foundations, and other private agencies, and the government in regard to world affairs.

The particular recommendation of the Morrill committee to which we wish to refer in this report is the one calling for

a new private organization "to strengthen the educational leadership of American universities and colleges in world affairs." In the words of the report, this organization "would provide a continuing mechanism for consideration of educational needs and opportunities in world affairs, facilitate the planning and appraisal of international educational programs, and promote the wise development and employment of educational resources." It would have "a governing board of national stature drawn from universities, colleges, and the public," and it would be "established in close relationship with existing private institutions.....such as the Association of American Universities, the American Council on Education, and the Institute of International Education."

To put it briefly and bluntly, we believe that such an organization will probably be formed, and that the student-personnel point of view should be taken explicitly into account in the way it is planned, organized, and operated. We suggest that NASPA has a responsibility here, and have had this in mind in considering the action we will later recommend.

This brings us to the context of "operations and administrative organization."

Last year we were awaiting publication of the Langmuir study of "the status of foreign-student advising in U.S. colleges and universities," and the results of the study of "university administration of higher education" then being conducted by W. F. Dyde at the University of Colorado. Both became available shortly after our last conference. For your committee's purposes, what they do is to document quite fully what everyone here had known impressionistically, namely, that there is a great variety of kinds and degrees of responsibility devolving on the deans of students in relation to a wide range of types and sizes of foreign-student programs on our several campuses.

The Langmuir study tells us that 40% of the 40,000 foreign students in the country are enrolled at the 2% of our institutions which enroll 300 or more each. 84% of the 700 foreign-student advisers studied spent one-fourth time or less in that capacity. 42% report directly to the president; only 16% report to the dean of students. This last statistic bears interesting qualifications according to the size of the institution and the relative size of the foreign-student population. Indeed, from the point of view of some of our questions concerning the responsibilities of the dean of students' office in relation to the foreign-student program, one can envisage an additional descriptive study addressing itself directly to those questions. Perhaps such a study should eventually be sponsored by NASPA. We do not recommend it at this time. We consider that enough descriptive information is in hand to lead to the next question, the normative one: what responsibilities should the dean have, or seek, or take in relation to his institution's exchange program?

The question can hardly be considered without reference to the work of the foreign-student adviser. The purpose of the student-personnel program is to aid students outside the classroom, "in their intellectual, social, moral, and personal development." This purpose is surely not suspended in the cases of students who are studying abroad under college auspices, or of students who have come from abroad. As for the latter, the foreign-student adviser is presumably committed to the same basic purpose, whether he is officially a member of the student-personnel staff or not. Even where the dean and the foreign-student adviser are in different campus hierarchies, they are clearly natural allies and should have the best possible understanding of each other's aims and methods.

Translating these observations from the campus to the sphere of the national associations, we again confront the more or less perennial question of the years since World War II as to the relationship, conceptual and practical, between NASPA and NAFSA. We think the question arises again at this moment of history in somewhat changed and newly urgent form. The action we want to propose to you is intended as a fresh attack on the old problem of the inter-associational relationship, and at the same time, as the best first step towards taking up an appropriate role in regard to the new federal programs and the new vision of higher education's responsibility in world affairs.

NAFSA's identity is not a simple one. We understand that it, like us, has the matter of its future role and even its name under more or less continuous study. Despite the present title, it represents a federation of several specialties in the work of international exchange of persons. It offers individual, as well as institutional membership, and the latter is not restricted to colleges and universities. As student-personnel workers, those NAFSA members whose work is the advising of students might participate in these NASPA conferences to everyone's advantage.

As an association concerned with foreign students, NASPA might, unless we are misinformed, become an institutional member of NAFSA. Numerous other forms of alliance between the two associations can be imagined. NASPA, as we have attempted to suggest in this report, and NAFSA, as its officers have often made clear, are both importantly implicated in the impending "break-through" in international education.

We therefore offer the following recommendation.

We recommend that the President, in consultation with the chairmen of Commission I and the Committee on International Exchange of Students, be in communication with the President of NAFSA, if possible in advance of NAFSA's annual meeting in late April, with a view to arranging the appointment of a joint working Committee of representatives of the two associations, charged as follows:

1. To analyze the relationship between NASPA and NAFSA and recommend standing procedures for cooperation in furtherance of objectives common to both associations; and

2. To meet periodically between this spring and the time of next year's association meetings to exchange views and prepare any appropriate reports or recommendations as to the interests of the two associations in relation to new federal or other major programs in international education (the reasonable expenses for meetings to be borne jointly by the two associations upon approval of the executive bodies.)

Mr. Chairman, that ends the report. I move its acceptance with the understanding that I stated at the opening; namely, that the approval of the recommendation itself, as such, will come before this body as a separate item of business tomorrow morning after there has been opportunity to discuss it with Commission I.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN REID: It has been moved and seconded that this report be accepted. Is there any discussion or are there any questions of John with regard to the Committee's activities? If not, we will take the vote. All in favor signify by saying "aye"; opposed. The motion is carried.

We neglected to approve the report of the Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations, and at this time I would like to have an approval of that Committee's report.

DEAN THOMAS L. BROADBENT (University of California at Riverside): I move it be accepted.

DEAN ROBERT SHAFFER (Indiana University): Second the motion.

CHAIRMAN REID: Any discussion on that report?

DEAN ZILLMAN (University of Wisconsin): May I ask a question on that? Was that Bill Toombs report just now?

CHAIRMAN REID: Yes.

DEAN ZILLMAN: Would you read again, Bill, the action part of that report, please. Is he here?

CHAIRMAN REID: Is Bill here? We will get Bill back up and have him read it a little later. He probably went down to get breakfast. We will see if we can get him now.

DEAN ZILLMAN: Thanks. Go ahead and pass it. He can get this later on.

CHAIRMAN REID: We will read it before it is passed.

We will hold that in abeyance, the action, until we can comply with this request.

Our third and last Committee report this morning -- no, it is not our last, but our third Committee report, is on Membership, and Dean McLeod will present it.

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD (Chairman, Committee on Membership, Northwestern University): Thank you, Juan. Through correspondence with the members of the Committee, which was selected on the basis of geographical distribution, under the directives from the Executive Committee we report the following:

First, the completion of the brochure, now in your hands, which outlines in brief form the purposes and organizational structure of NASPA.

Second, after due deliberation that we retain the present institutional basis of membership for four year colleges which are degree granting and accredited by their regional agencies.

Third, that newly created colleges which are integral parts of existing public institutions -- for example, Delta College of the University of Michigan -- be granted full membership.

That we seek the membership of all colleges and universities presently eligible, and urge our present members to extend these invitations within their respective areas.

We strongly urge the continuation of our present policy of inviting those persons serving in the areas of student personnel and guidance to attend national meetings of NASPA.

We commend to the Executive Committee the extension of our liaison with regional groups of personnel workers now meeting at least annually in the several areas.

Considered, but not acted upon, were the following: The question of associate membership for non-accredited institutions. A special membership to be extended to junior colleges. A review of the present policy of individual mailings of both proceedings and bulletins. This was a matter of whether or not it was the better part of wisdom to continue to mail out to people who were in institutions not eligible for membership at considerably less cost and getting practically the full benefit for a very small fee. This is not because the Chairman is a Scotchman. Professional memberships of individuals, upon approval of the Executive Committee, for those persons not connected with institutions of higher education but whose aims and purposes are the promotion of higher education.



This completes the report, and is the result of considerable correspondence between the Chairman and the constituent membership, and indicates that we have tried to consider the various areas which are worthy of our consideration at this time.

I would like to point out that when we met in Colorado Springs, our total membership at that time was approximately 340, and our present membership is 373.

By a little hard work on the part of the individual members of NASPA, in their various areas, the extension of fellowship and the urgency to relate themselves to the organization, I can see an increasing membership for the organization.

This completes the report. I recommend its approval.

CHAIRMAN REID: It has been moved that we adopt the report. Is there a second?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN REID: Is there any further discussion or any questions to be asked of Jim?

DEAN JACK MATTHEWS (University of Missouri): Jim, you indicated a continuation of the institutional membership. Would you mind giving a brief resume of the rationale on that point?

DEAN McLEOD: Yes. A feeling that the advantages which obtain for the institutions which are members is such that there is a principle representative who has the voting right of his institution in all of our national gatherings and in the approval of policies, but that the entire staff of that institution is eligible to attend and may attend all of the meetings. And I think that there is the feeling that there are distinct advantages in institutional membership as offered against individual membership.

This is in general the policy of both NADAM and NASPA since its inception, if I am correct.

DEAN JAMES B. MACRAE (Lincoln University): One question. Is the enrollment at the convention institutional or individual?

DEAN McLEOD: The enrollment --

DEAN MACRAE: The registration at the convention.

DEAN McLEOD: The registration is individual.

DEAN S. J. HOUSE (Newark College of Engineering): Jim, why has the Committee held off taking any action on the

associate membership, or whatever you had in mind, for the junior colleges?

DEAN McLEOD: Either or both? Do you mean associate membership or junior colleges?

DEAN HOUSE: Why haven't you done anything? Why isn't anything being done now? I am thinking of the fact that the junior college movement is beginning to become quite important in many of our states.

DEAN McLEOD: This was not the prerogative of the individual membership. It was brought up and was discussed and will be further discussed by the Executive Committee, but we were not at the point of being ready to make a recommendation at this time. It was certainly seriously discussed yesterday in our meeting, and there is no question in my mind or the members of the Committee on Membership but what there is considerable value, in view of the fact, as one of the representatives of the junior college pointed out, they have them in the toughest two years they are going to have in college, and they are making a notable contribution to our totality of higher education.

No question about it, and I think it is worthy of consideration; but the Membership Committee did not make a recommendation at that time.

DEAN JOHN SUMMERSKILL (Cornell University): Has the Committee given any thought to establishing an individual membership opportunity in addition to the institutional membership, as many organizations have done?

DEAN McLEOD: Yes, I think they have, but have not come up with a recommendation at that point. I think these are matters which have to have much more discussion than a committee which met for the first time at this convention could afford it.

I think they are worthy of discussion. I hope there will be considerable discussion, because the Membership Committee is very sympathetic with all of the recommendations that have been made to it by members and related groups who are represented here.

Are there any other questions?

Thank you, Juan.

CHAIRMAN REID: If there are no further questions or any further discussion, we will have a vote on the adoption of the report. All in favor signify by saying "aye"; opposed. It is carried.

Our last committee report is the very important one of the Committee on Nominations and Place. It is always chaired by the senior former President in attendance at the Conference,

and this is "Shorty" Nowotny.

DEAN NOWOTNY (Chairman, Committee on Nominations and Place): The Committee is listed, in part, on page 16 of your program. I might read those names, the seven Past Presidents in attendance.

Jack Stibbs of Tulane; John Hocutt, University of Delaware; Ted Baldwin, Cornell; Don DuShane of Oregon; Fred Turner of Illinois; and Don Winbigler of Stanford. Then, the members elected, six, at large: Robert Etheridge of Miami, Oxford; Dave Harris, Ripon; Marion Huit, State University of Iowa; Pat Ratterman of Xavier; Mark Smith of Denison; Ted Zillman, University of Wisconsin.

This Committee met and is ready to make a report.

The first thing they recommended was not within their province. It was the unanimous recommendation, and it was carried to the Executive Committee, and that motion was passed also by the Executive Committee. I think Don DuShane will make that part of our report at this time. This distinguished gentleman is a political scientist as well as the dean from Eugene, Oregon.

DEAN DuSHANE: Thank you, "Shorty." Mr. President, here with us today there is a man of great ability who has a fine record of unbroken attendance at NASPA Conferences, a wide acquaintanceship among those of us who have been meeting here before, unfailing good nature, devoted by his record, both to NADAM and to NASPA. By unanimous vote, the Committee on Nominations recommends, and this reaches you with the 100% approval of the Executive Committee, that Leo Isen, Conference Reporter, be made an honorary member of this Association. (Applause)

There are only two honorary members on the rolls of this Association, Alvin Duerr, elected many years ago, and H. Roe Bartle, elected in Albuquerque in 1940. Leo Isen, with his brother, Joe, before him, has been our reporter for 25 years, and the Isens have been the only reporters ever recording our conventions.

I move the approval of this recommendation.

DEAN JAMES E. FOY (Auburn University): Second the motion.

DEAN NOWOTNY: You have heard the motion, and it is seconded. Is there any discussion?

DEAN MATTHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I assume this honorary membership carries with it, as in the case of the organization which Mr. Duerr represents, and also the city of Kansas City, and also Mr. Isen's business, the institutional fee of \$25.00. (Laughter)

DEAN NOWOTNY: Leo, that was unkind. (Laughter)  
A typical Jack Matthews politics. That question is out of  
order, and do not record it in the minutes. (Laughter)

This is without salary, without emolument, and with-  
out fees. All in favor of this wonderful motion say "aye."  
Opposed, "no." Leo, we are brothers in the flesh.

Will you please enter, President Weaver says,  
"prolonged applause" after adoption of this, (laughter)  
"a standing ovation." Nowotny was standing, will you please  
put that in. He is doing the best he could.

DEAN BROADBENT: I think we ought to have an off-  
the-record speech from Leo. (Applause)

... Remarks off the record by Leo Isen ...

DEAN NOWOTNY: To show you the devotion that Leo  
has, as a young member of our staff -- we are not like Mis-  
souri and the other boys, we do not have much travel budget --  
this young man on our staff --

DEAN TURNER: Mr. Chairman, could we ask "Shorty"  
to speak English? We cannot hear what he says.

DEAN NOWTONY: Shall I stand back?

DEAN MARK SMITH (Denison University): No, sit down.  
(Laughter)

DEAN NOWOTNY: That is my bodyguard, Mark Smith.  
(Laughter)

This young man at French Lick, the last thing he  
said to me was, "Give Leo my regards," and I think all of us  
think of him as an associate member, and now an honorary mem-  
ber, the only one present.

This Committee that I mentioned a while ago has a  
report to make, and if you look at your record you will notice  
that we have a lot of Officers. We do not have to elect a  
Secretary-Treasurer because Carl Knox has another two years to  
go, and last year you elected a Conference Chairman-Designate,  
Dean O. D. Roberts, and, of course, he has been snooping  
around here and getting ready for Northwestern, so we do not  
have anything to do about that.

This Committee is charged with nominating a President  
Designate who will be in charge year after next and two Vice-  
Presidents-Designate, so those are the only three Officers  
that we have to nominate.

Now, on the time and place of meeting, in '63, you  
have already voted to go to Northwestern, at a summer confer-  
ence. McLeod has promised bathing beauties, and everything

in Chicago free -- free beer, free pretzels -- from June 24 to 27. Then again in the Midwest in '64, at Detroit, with Hal Stewart. And going East, the University of Washington, with Armour Blackburn. And then going West, in the summer, to Seattle in '66. That you have already adopted.

Now, for '67, your Committee recommends unanimously that we accept the invitation of Jimmy Allen and go to Texas, in Lubbock, Texas, and in '68 to Urbana, Illinois, with Fred Turner and Carl Knox as hosts.

I see no reason for making this in separate motions. We move that in '67 we go to Lubbock, Texas, and in '68 to Urbana, Illinois. Shall I put the motion?

I move the adoption of this part of our report.

CHAIRMAN REID: It has been moved that in 1967 we go to Lubbock, Texas, and in 1968 to Urbana, Illinois. I will consider this as one motion. Is there a second?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN REID: Is there any discussion of the motion?

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: Any statement of time?

CHAIRMAN REID: "Shorty," was there any designation?

DEAN NOWOTNY: April, both times.

CHAIRMAN REID: April, both times. Any discussion? Any questions of "Shorty"? All in favor of the motion signify by saying "aye"; opposed. The motion is carried.

DEAN NOWOTNY: I will make these three Officers in one package. If anybody wants to nominate from the floor for President Designate or Vice Presidents, you may do so.

For President, the Committee nominates James McLeod of Northwestern, and the two Vice Presidents-Designate, Mark Smith of Denison and Glen Nygreen of Kent State. If anybody wants to separate this package, they may.

I move the adoption of this report.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN REID: It has been moved that the President Designate for next year be Jim McLeod, and the two Vice Presidents, Mark Smith and Glen Nygreen, and now we will open the nominations from the floor. Do we have any nominations from the floor?

All right, it has been moved that we accept all three of these. Is there a second to the motion?

DEAN JAMES G. ALLEN (Texas Tech. College): I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN REID: Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying "aye"; opposed. It is carried. The three men are elected.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: "Shorty," may I interrupt long enough to ask these persons who have been nominated to come forward so we can see who they are.

Mark, would you and Glen and Jimmy -- you have already seen Jim once, but please come up, or just rise. This is Mark Smith, the bodyguard of "Shorty" Nowotny, Glen and Jim. I just did not want anybody to mistake Mark Smith for "Shorty" Nowotny. (Applause as they arose)

... President Weaver resumed the Chair ...

PRESIDENT WEAVER: We will proceed immediately -- I can always tell when "Shorty" has been here -- with the report of commissions, and Hal Stewart will preside.

... Vice President Stewart assumed the Chair ...

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Commission IV. The fairly extensive report of Commission IV is a mimeographed form. I assume that many of you already have copies of it. It is outside this entrance. Those of you who came in the back door --

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: There are copies down there too, Hal.

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Oh, there are copies down there too. Thanks, Carl. They point out that the mimeographed reports of Commissions V and VI are also there, as well as the prospectus which is prepared by Commission VIII, and which this assembly was appraised yesterday is also available now for your information.

Carl Krathwohl, Chairman of Commission IV, will summarize -- not what I said, Carl -- will summarize the report of Commission IV.

DEAN CARLTON L. KRATHWOHL (Chairman, Commission IV, Syracuse University): Thanks, Hal. I read you fully.

I will make reference, of course, to the fact that this is a seven-page report, and if I were to read all of it we might not get on to the rest of the business. But in addition to not reading it, I will also indicate that I will not tell any jokes. That might be a blessing of no untold measure.

I would like to refer to the members of the Commission who are listed on page 21 and thank them for their cooperation. I would not bother to read their names because you can do that.

For the year 1961-62, Commission IV has been spending its time in a review of the past, and in organization for the future. It was interesting to note that this Commission is basically ten years old, and it was created at the St. Louis Conference in 1951, made its first report in 1952, and it was one of the first four commissions organized at that time.

The charged responsibility that it was given then is as follows: "This commission shall assist the members of our association in formulating the criteria and techniques by which they may most effectively appraise their own programs and work. The commission should further have a responsibility for encouraging and facilitating the exchange of ideas on program and practices among member institutions."

In this mimeographed report is an historical summary, of which I will point out one or two things in my remarks.

The Commission's first report in 1952 bore the recommendation that it be continued, and that it seriously proceed with the matter of examining processes of evaluation. In '53 it made a very extensive report, which included the presentation of an "Evaluation Aids" document. This was its first evidence of an attempt to provide a service to our membership, at that time, and for use by the membership. It also made other recommendations, including proposals for relationship with other associations and for the attempt to seek foundation support.

This same kind of work continued through '54 and '55, with the attempt to further promote the use of evaluation procedures on the part of the members of the association, and for closer relationships with other organizations, especially the American Council on Education, its Committee on Student Personnel.

Then, in '56, '57, and '58, there seemed to be a three-year hiatus, in which no reports were presented, but a renewal in '59 brought us back to the old topic of providing some kind of an evaluation instrument, and most of you have been aware of the efforts of the Commission to sell the idea of the Rackham schedule.

Finally in '60 the members were not only urged to use this instrument, but they were provided copies and asked to use it and report on it later.

The most recent report of Commission IV, last year at Colorado Springs, indicated that several institutions had

used the Rackham schedule and had reported reactions to it; however the reaction data was not too specific, and we will review it again to see if there are any worthwhile notes to convey to you.

A second item was reported, which related to a membership survey, and I will report on that a little more fully in another moment or two.

Also included in the mimeographed report is a section entitled "Consideration of Commission IV's Raison d'être." I hope there is some reason for being, after our attempt to have an open meeting, or a meeting of the Commission members with the members of NASPA on Sunday evening. The response was very limited, almost non-existent, in fact. However, the purpose of that meeting was to have a consideration of the objectives of Commission IV. These are summarized in the mimeographed report, and a proposal is made to revise these objectives, stated on page 4, and shortly we will have a more positive recommendation relative to them.

The basic objective of next year's work for Commission IV is to provide service as fully as possible to as many members of the association as are interested and desirous of help.

Now, this objective can be realized by intensive encouragement and participation in evaluation projects, dissemination of information regarding studies that have been conducted which are pertinent to student personnel work, and by the actual providing of assistance to individual members that are engaged in evaluation projects. And the Commission met, and I would want you to know that we had 90% attendance, or explanation for absence, inasmuch as two members could not attend, but the seven out of ten members who are present at this Conference responded well to correspondence prior to the Conference and were most faithful in attending the two meetings that we have had here.

The concern in the formulation of our activities for the coming year has resulted in the preparation of two requests. One of these is a request for financial support which has been made to the Executive Committee, and it is our understanding will be reviewed and decided upon. The second is that the membership review and approve of the new statement of objectives for Commission IV, which I referred to previously, and at the conclusion of this report I will include that in the motion for acceptance.

We would like to take just a moment or two longer this morning and report on two studies that have been made, just so you recognize one of the kinds of services that this Commission can provide you.

The first of these was a survey of NASPA membership regarding evaluation studies which the individual members had conducted. This was prepared and implemented by Dave Robinson



of Emory University, who, in the summer of 1960 sent out 347 inquiries, and had a very fine response, 271, which constitutes a percentage response of slightly over 78 percent. Of these responses, there were 42 institutions, or 15.5 of the number responding that indicated that studies had been made or were in progress, and information regarding those studies has been received. Secondly, there were an additional 36 institutions, or 13+ percent of those responding that were planning studies. Self studies of student personnel services seem to predominate, although there were other types as well.

Now, the real importance of these findings is the fact that there is interest and activity in evaluation of student personnel work and, secondly, that there are ideas and results which may be utilized in preparing studies and in making comparison with results.

The second activity in the area of evaluation which I would like to refer to is a project known as the Inter-University Visitation, and I would certainly welcome questions either afterwards or individually later, relative to this study, because those of us who were involved in it think it is pretty good.

This was an experience in cooperative evaluation by four universities in New York State. A two-year project with the University of Buffalo, Cornell University, the University of Rochester, and Syracuse University; this was a project that was jointly planned by the staff members of those four institutions, and it was based on a series of visits to each of the institutions by the other three institutions. There were two visits scheduled during the academic year 1960-61 and two during 1961-62, the final or fourth visit being concluded about the middle of March. The host institution selected three areas of student personnel work to be examined by the visiting institutions, and in advance prepared materials for review by the visiting teams. The visits were of approximately one and a half days' duration, and the visiting teams, for the most part consisting of 15 to 20 members, generally about 6 or 7 from each school, observed the areas that were to be examined, and they reviewed this advance material and had interviews with students, with faculty, with staff, and prepared a report on their findings.

These reports were presented orally at a luncheon meeting on the last day and then presented more fully in writing later.

The outcomes of the study we are in the process of formulating a little more systematically, but there is an indication also that there will be some kind of a follow-up on it.

Just in summary, let me say that Commission IV feels very strongly that this is an area that has all too long been neglected, partly because of the institutions feeling the lack of time.

Now, I am sure that there can always be a 25th or 26th hour squeezed out of each day to devote to such worthwhile activity, but the Commission does feel that things are being done in evaluation in student personnel work, and in certain instances by our own membership, and that there are materials being prepared that the members ought to be aware of, and maybe one of the ways in which our Commission can do it is to make these references known to you and perhaps even do some extracting from them.

For example, the two that have been prepared as recently initiated services by the U.S. Office of Education, The Reporter service and the Special Reports, another one by the ACE which reports questionnaires in progress, are sources of information about evaluation studies and can contain some valuable information for you. One other, also published by the U.S. Office of Education, a Summary of Unpublished Studies in Research in School and College Personnel Services.

We have the anticipated activity for next year of gathering this material together, preparing a bibliography for you, and further extracting more fully the data included in these reports. Commission IV feels that an association such as NASPA should be considerably more active in this field and within the association should be rendering a continuing and effective service to the entire membership.

This concludes the report, and I move its acceptance with the inclusion of the approval of the new statement of objectives for Commission IV.

CHAIRMAN STEWART: You have heard the motion. Is there a second?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

CHAIRMAN STEWART: Discussion or questions? If not, all in favor. Opposed. The report is adopted.

I would like to say, you may have noticed that Carl has a cast on his foot. This is not due to his placing that appendage in the spot so thoughtfully provided by providence in his president's anatomy, or even that of a tackle whom he may have tossed out of school. Like most of us deans, he just got his feet tangled up, this time on a ski slope.

We will not have time this morning for reports of Commissions V, VI, and VII. These will be held over until tomorrow. I would call your attention to the fact that Commissions V and VI, both their mimeographed reports, both contain recommendations and resolutions for this body to consider. These will be brought to the floor for action tomorrow morning and I think Fred would like me to say that it will facilitate matters a great deal if you gentlemen would get up just about fifteen minutes earlier so that you can be down at the meeting and we can start the meeting promptly at nine o'clock tomorrow

morning.

Fred.

... President Weaver resumed the Chair ...

PRESIDENT WEAVER: In order to expedite the business of this session and not unduly impair the effectiveness of the next one, our plan is to have one more item of business now, and that is the presentation of the point that Ted Zillman asked for, out of Bill Toombs' report. Then I would appreciate it if the persons here would, insofar as it is consistent with your plans, remain for the next session, which will begin within about two or three minutes thereafter. The next session is one which is important inasmuch as we have invited a very distinguished man to come to address us, and I hope that we will not be unduly delayed in getting it started.

Will you give your attention at this time to the detail that was postponed from Bill Toombs' report. I think we can bring this meeting to a conclusion.

VICE PRESIDENT REID: We are asking John Gillis to present this one little item, since Bill Toombs is in charge of the ladies' program, and he is involved with them at this time. John would you come up.

DEAN JOHN GILLIS (Illinois State Normal University, Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations): I think the suggestion which the Committee had in terms of a concrete proposal was that the Executive Committee authorize our Committee to proceed with the preparation of some sort of a directory of national organizations who direct their efforts primarily towards students. This would no doubt take the form of some preliminary investigation first, and then perhaps a mimeographed document which might be available next year for further revision and ultimately perhaps result in a directory similar to the directory to professional organizations which has been recently completed.

Is there anything I can do to clarify this?

DEAN ZILLMAN: John, thanks for your explanation. I think it was about eight or ten years ago I spoke to just such a proposal. I hope that yours does not contain the things that alarmed me in that one some years ago. This was that NASPA, in this directory now, give an evaluation of the student group. I think that if we are going to be about building our own lists similar to the Attorney General's list, I for one want to say a few words of caution and utter a caveat or two about it.

I hope that this is not what you are proposing for us to do, since I think we all recognize that, let's say the Young Sons of the New Frontier on one campus might be well received and well regarded, whereas, on another campus somebody might tell you that they are a bunch of damn communists.

Now, I think if NASPA is going to make evaluations of these groups, and print them, who is going to be the person that arrives at the evaluation of each individual group? I think there is some real concern for all of us here, and there are not only ethical, but there are legal implications in what we do along these lines that I think are most important for all of us, and I just want to say those few words of caution about your proposal.

DEAN GILLIS: I think the intent of the Committee was certainly not to evaluate the organizations, but to provide information, and any statements that would be made concerning the organizations, I presume, would be simply informational, in the same sense, I think, that our current directory of professional organizations attempts to briefly state what the organization itself says it is trying to do. This is not an Attorney General's list that we are preparing.

VICE PRESIDENT REID: Is there any other question or discussion regarding the report of this Committee?

... The question was called for ...

VICE PRESIDENT REID: We will take a vote for approval. All in favor signify by saying "aye." Opposed. The report is accepted.

VICE PRESIDENT STEWART: Our Parliamentarian, Don DuShane, has requested me to read to you, in accordance with the procedures recently adopted by this organization, the two proposals of Commission V and the two from Commission VI. I will do this purely as a matter of information at this time and as a form of putting it before you.

Commission V recommends for adoption, one, this resolution: "That each member of NASPA, through means available to him and within the limits of his institutional situation, should establish close and continuing relationships with the behavioral science faculty members and departments of his institution, relationships which provide for contributions by the behavioral scientists to planning, research, and decisions in the student personnel area and for contributions by the student personnel staff to research in the behavioral sciences."

They also recommend resolution two: "That NASPA, through its membership, commissions, and committees, should seek to acquaint persons interested in careers in student personnel administration with the importance, in terms of the employability and effectiveness, of training in an academic discipline and ability to qualify for academic rank and for classroom teaching."

Commission VI is recommending the following two resolutions:

"1. The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators strongly endorses continuation of the federal loan program for college students, and recommends that the present institutional limit of \$250,000 per annum be eliminated, and

"2. The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators strongly urges the Congress to establish a federal scholarship program for academically qualified and financially needy students."

I call your attention again to the fact that these resolutions are incorporated in the mimeographed reports of these Commissions which are available at the doors.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: It is now ten-thirty, and we will adjourn this meeting and reconvene, please, within five minutes, to begin the next session of the morning.

... The Conference recessed at ten-thirty o'clock ...

---

#### FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

The Fourth General Session convened at ten-forty o'clock, Carl M. Grip, Dean of Men, Temple University, NASPA Executive Committee, presiding.

CHAIRMAN GRIP: Will the meeting please come to order. We have a few announcements from Convention Program Chairman Glen Nygreen. (Applause)

DEAN NYGREEN (Conference Chairman): Thank you all. I bespeak your attention to these few short announcements. We managed to keep the extra announcements to this one time. First, let me say that Luncheon B, the discussion of "Counseling Provisions for the Future," is being relocated. It will be held in the Foyer, which is really a separate room just off this ballroom, just outside the ballroom door. You will find it to your right. The luncheon will be held there.

Luncheon Table No. 7 this noon, in the Franklin Room, will be chaired by John Truitt, Director of Men's Affairs, Michigan State University. He graciously agreed to accept that assignment in the absence, because of illness, of Dean Herbert Wunderlich, of Kansas State. Thank you, John, very much.

The Executive Committee will meet in the Poor Richard Room immediately at the conclusion of this session.

I want to express my appreciation to John Gwin, who has agreed to preside at the Banquet this evening, again, in the absence because of a throat infection of Lyle Reynolds, of the University of California at Santa Barbara.

Chairman John Hocutt calls for a brief meeting of Commission II at four p.m. this afternoon in the Lafayette Room.

Are there any other announcements that need to be made at this time? One final announcement then is this: May I see a show of hands of those people who are planning to go on the two bus tours tomorrow -- the bus tours listed on page 14 of your program, and scheduled at one p.m. They will be at one p.m. as shown on the program, and not two p.m. as shown on the ditto sheets that were given you. Will you please raise your hands if you are planning to go on the bus tours tomorrow at one p.m. You had better stand, Carl, and take a count. You take the left and I will take the right. There are about twenty. Thank you very much. That is all.

CHAIRMAN GRIP: Thank you, Glen. Our program today, in a sense, comes nicely after the program yesterday afternoon. We have with us a lawyer who is humane, and this reminds me of

a fellow who preceded him here in Philadelphia. Professor Byse spent some years at the University of Pennsylvania and he probably knows some of the stories, all of them true, about a very famous and peculiar, unusual attorney who lived in this town for a number of years, Jimmy Patterson. This young fellow came from a very prominent family, and his father was a very prominent attorney himself.

By the time he was midway through law school he was a confirmed alcoholic, and it wasn't too long until his family disowned him. He had a brilliant legal mind, however, and he ended up living in a small hotel downtown and occasionally showing up in court. When he did show up, if he sat in the back of the courtroom, the judge would not hesitate to appoint him as counsel for an indigent defendant. He became a very brilliant trial lawyer, and his clientele was mostly the disenfranchised and the crooks in town. He was the bane of the prosecuting attorneys.

One day, a very prominent family was embarrassed to find that their chauffeur had absconded with the car and, of all places to have an accident, had crashed into another limousine in front of the Union League Club. The Chinese chauffeur was arrested and accused of drunken driving. The family was distressed when the other family would not agree to not press charges if the costs for repairing the automobile were paid. The other family insisted upon the case being prosecuted.

So it went to court in due time, and the chief witness was the then chief police surgeon, who was a bear on drunks, and would personally come down in the middle of the night to administer some kind of a test for drunkenness. Jimmy knew this, and so when he went to court, he casually sat next to the police surgeon, and he whispered to him after the trial had begun, "Did you allow for this fellow's wooden leg when you were giving him the walk-the-line test?" And the surgeon looked with disdain at him and said, "Of course." No further mention was made of this until in the course of presenting the defense testimony, Patterson turned to the chauffeur and he said, "Will you please raise your right pants leg," and he did, and there was a very healthy leg, and he then ended his case.

The police surgeon jumped to his feet and he said, "Raise your left pants leg," and he did, and there too was a good leg, and the judge immediately dismissed the case. (Laughter)

We hope that attorneys might all be as humane as Jimmy Patterson, and we hope, Mr. Byse, particularly that you might consider deans with your humanity as well as people.

Many of the people in our profession have been, in recent years, sorely perplexed by a number of legal problems. We have one of our best exhibits on display over at my right. John Hocutt has had, what -- four cases in the last four years, John?

DEAN HOCUTT: About that.

CHAIRMAN GRIP: I think it is more than he wants to remember. In talking to deans around the country about these problems, one of the things that has become very apparent is that there is a diversity of kinds of problems. I want to mention three particular groups of problems, one of which we will discuss today. The first is that the changing nature of the law with respect to the tort actions against private and public institutions, in both instances the court interpretations of the nature of a private or chartered institution, and the matter of immunity of the public institution, in both of these areas there have been substantial changes, with the result that we are seeing more suits against universities for damages.

The second area involves the area of privileged communication of the records of students. And the third involves our procedural aspects; that is, the procedures we use in dealing with students, particularly in the unpleasant dealings that we have with students.

This is obviously too great a field to cover in one meeting, and we have restricted our topic today to the third. Our speaker is Clark Byse, Professor of Administrative Law at the Harvard University School of Law. He comes from Wisconsin, and he has two degrees from Wisconsin, and a Doctor of Jurisprudence from Columbia. He practices briefly in Wisconsin, went on to become instructor of law at the University of Iowa, and then moved to the University of Pennsylvania where, over a few years, he became Professor of Law. He served not only three years in the Navy, but a number of federal agencies. More important has been the fact that he has for a long time been associated with the American Association of University Professors and holds the position of counsel to the American Association of University Professors.

He has had an enduring interest in the area of the freedoms of students and faculty, and it is with great pleasure that I present to you this morning Mr. Clark Byse, who will talk to us -- and there is a slight change in this title -- on "Procedure in Student Dismissal Proceedings: Law and Policy." Mr. Clark Byse. (Applause)

MR. CLARK BYSE (Professor of Administrative Law, Harvard University School of Law): Thank you, Dean Grip, and-- there are ladies here, I see -- Ladies and Gentlemen: I think there is at least one thing that we lawyers and you deans have in common. All the conventions I have attended of lawyers always run late, and somebody always gets up and says, "The bus that was supposed to go at two will be going at one, and the meeting that was supposed to be in room X will be in room Y, and a meeting that was supposed to be chaired by Mr. X will be chaired by Mr. Y, and so on." So I feel at home listening to the words and comments, the words that have been uttered.



I cannot help recall a story that really comes to me every time I attend one of these sessions. The story is told by a dean's wife about her husband, so it is a story about deans, you see. She said that at the time he was wedding her -- and I must say he was somewhat of a garrulous fellow; a very fine fellow, but he did like to talk. She said that as he was wedding her, he was supposed to put the ring on her finger and say, "With all my worldly good I do thee endow." He got it mixed up and said, "With all my goodly words I do thee endow." (Laughter)

I cannot help but think that you folks are being inflicted with goodly words, and I am going to add to the torrent myself.

When Dean Grip first asked me to make these remarks, he said there might be some questions or comments afterward and would I object. The answer, of course, was "No." You say to yourself, "You make the speech; you are up on the platform and nobody likes to break the ice, and we will make a few little chitchatty remarks, and that is all there is to it, so of course I am perfectly happy." Well, last night, about eight o'clock, I didn't have anything to do so I wandered into the Franklin Suite, called Seminar I on "Student Discipline: Adapting Continuing Responsibilities to Changing Situations" (laughter) and I listened to the speaker, Dean Marsh. It was a thoughtful, balanced, perceptive, restrained speech. I thought, "I am getting just what I came for: enlightenment, balance, and so on." And then, wow! (Laughter) I won't say the bottom dropped out, but the hammers came from every side.

I took notes. "We are being trapped by the term 'due process'," said one distinguished speaker. I know he was distinguished because he is a dean. (Laughter) "It is just a matter of splitting hairs. It is a semantic bit," and then he sort of mumbled off. (Laughter)

And then another one told the story about the surgeon, the engineer, and the lawyer arguing about who had the oldest profession of the three. The surgeon said, "I do, because who created Eve out of Adam's rib?" "But surgeon," said the engineer, "before there was Eve there must have been a world, and before there was a world there was nothing but chaos, and we created the world." And the lawyer said, "Yes, and who created the chaos?" (Laughter) This was my first reaction, you see, my introduction. (Laughter)

Then they went on: If we provide due process, we might have a disintegration of student character because they will insist upon being proved guilty, lie, and take the 5th amendment, and so on. I have some more choice bits here. One of them I thought was most impressive and that is: Who is running the institution? Are we, or the courts? If the courts are, let them intervene, otherwise let us run it.

We have taken so much time with so many announcements and introductory stories that maybe I can run this right to twelve-thirty, and then maybe there won't be any questions. (Laughter) But let me be at my business.

In a striking passage, Mr. Justice Holmes admonished his hearers, "If you want to know the law...., you must look at it as a bad man, who cares only for the material consequences which such knowledge enables him to predict...."<sup>1</sup> Later in his address, the Justice stated, "The prophecies of what the courts will do in fact, and nothing more pretentious, are what I mean by the law."<sup>2</sup> At still another point, he told his audience that if they would understand the law, they should wash its doctrines in "cynical acid."<sup>3</sup>

I am sure none in this assemblage is a bad man. I am not going to change that statement in light of my introduction last night, but I think I might not have been quite so sure. (Laughter) None is bad, but there are some who misunderstand. But in any event, I am sure there are some here who may wish, even though they are not a bad man, to look at the law's procedural requirements in student dismissal proceedings through the lenses of Holmes' amoral friend. If such there be, they should be warned that predicting "what courts will do in fact" often is a baffling, frustrating, and unrewarding experience. This is so because of the nature of law. Although to a bad man law may be what judges will do in fact, this is of small help to the judge who must in fact do something. A judge obviously cannot escape his responsibility to decide controversies according to the law by saying to himself, "Well, the law is what I shall decide."

How then will a judge determine whether the procedures that a college or university has followed in a student dismissal case are consistent with the law? Will he look to past cases and feel himself bound to render a decision in conformance with what he finds there? If he follows this principle of stare decisis, how much freedom does he retain to disregard what has been said in previous opinions, to distinguish the previous decisions or to narrow their holdings, to consider changed social conditions or new public attitudes, to view his responsibility not merely as "laying down a system of minimum restraints designed to keep the bad man in check .... but (as) helping to create a body of common morality which will define the good man"?<sup>4</sup> If there is no applicable precedent, to what sources shall he refer? To what extent, if at all, will his decision be affected by the "likes and dislikes, the predilections and the prejudices, the complex of instincts and emotions and habits and convictions, which make the man, whether he be litigant or judge"?<sup>5</sup>

Mr. Justice Cardozo explored these and related questions in his Storrs Lectures, later published under the title, *The Nature of the Judicial Process*, which I recommend to you as a perceptive, balanced, eloquent discussion of how judges should act. Although Cardozo believed that many, perhaps most,

of the cases that came before his court (which at that time was the Court of Appeals of the State of New York) could be decided only one way, there remained a group whose decision called for what he termed "the creative element in the judicial process."<sup>6</sup> Cardozo believed that "adherence to precedent should be the rule and not the exception," but he also recognized that when a legal doctrine was found to be "inconsistent with the sense of justice or with the social welfare," it should be abandoned.<sup>7</sup> The essence of Cardozo's conclusions concerning the role of the responsible judge is expressed in the following excerpts from his concluding chapter:

"Our survey of judicial methods teaches us, I think, the lesson that the whole subject matter of jurisprudence is more plastic, more malleable, the moulds less definitively cast, the bounds of right and wrong less pre-ordained and constant, than most of us, without the aid of some such analysis have been accustomed to believe. We like to picture to ourselves the field of the law as accurately mapped and plotted. We draw our little lines, and they are hardly down before we blur them. As in time and space, so here. Divisions are working hypotheses, adopted for convenience. We are tending more and more toward an appreciation of the truth that, after all, there are few rules; there are chiefly standards and degrees .... (The judge) must balance all his ingredients, his philosophy, his sense of right, and all the rest, and adding a little here and taking out a little there, must determine, as wisely as he can, which weight shall tip the scales. If this seems a weak and inclusive summary, I am not sure that the fault is mine. I know he is a wise pharmacist who from a recipe so general can compound a fitting remedy. But the like criticism may be made of most attempts to formulate the principles which regulate the practice of an art. .... After the wearisome process of analysis has been finished, there must be for every judge a new synthesis which he will have to make for himself. The most that he can hope for is that with long thought and study, with years of practice at the bar or on the bench, and with the aid of that inward grace which comes now and again to the elect of any calling, the analysis may help a little to make the synthesis a true one."<sup>8</sup>

The purpose of these brief and perhaps overly simplified comments concerning the nature of law and the judicial function is to make clear at the outset my conviction that the law is neither static nor mechanical and that judges have a continuously creative role in the development of the law. This is not to overlook, minimize, or denigrate the values of stability, predictability, and continuity that are served by adherence to precedent. It is, instead, to emphasize that law is an amalgam of the conflicting elements of stability and change, predictability and uncertainty, continuity and creativity. My colleague, Robert E. Keeton, has aptly described the role of the courts in accomodating these competing demands as one of assuring "creative continuity in the law."<sup>9</sup>

The particular relevance of creative continuity in the law governing the procedure to be followed in student dismissal proceedings will, I hope, become apparent when we consider, to paraphrase Holmes, "what in fact courts have done" and what they may be expected to do when dismissed students seek judicial assistance.

## I. WHAT IN FACT COURTS HAVE DONE

Although the number of reported decisions is relatively small, they reflect a broad range of judicial viewpoint concerning the law's procedural requirements in student dismissal proceedings.

At one extreme is an early Pennsylvania case involving Dickinson College.<sup>10</sup> The College was exempt from taxation and from time to time the state had made grants of pecuniary aid to the College. John M. Hill enrolled in the College in September, 1885. He continued his studies during that school year and enrolled for his second and last year in September 1886. On the evening of November 9 of that year, as the faculty was meeting, a certain disturbance occurred in the vicinity of the meeting room. In the words of President McCauley, the disturbance consisted of "hooting, singing, making noises, throwing small stones against the front window, and a large one thrown through the back window with great force which passed through both rooms, and in close proximity to some of the faculty, and out the front one." (Laughter)

Needless to say, this called for some action on the part of the faculty. (Laughter) The faculty met again one week later. At that meeting President McCauley stated that two days after the disturbance he had been informed by Robert Young, a janitor, that Mr. Hill "was there in great excitement, brandishing his arms, making a noise and running up into the college and out."

A member of the faculty, Professor Rittenhouse, reported that he had learned from a student that the student "had observed Hill at the disturbance and that he, the student, was surprised and disgusted." The name of the student was not disclosed to the faculty. Another member of the faculty, Professor Morgan, stated that "on the evening of November 9, and during the disturbance, he went to the hall door, and saw someone on the stairway leading to the story above, who appeared to be coming down, but who turned about when he observed him, Morgan, and hastened up again, making a noise in his haste to get away; that he asked Robert Young who he was, and received the reply that it was Hill, and he then concluded that that was the person."

Thereupon, Hill was summoned before the faculty. President McCauley addressed him as follows: "Mr. Hill, the faculty are satisfied that you were connected with the riotous

conduct of Tuesday night, the 9th c. November, and they have asked you to come in that you might make any statement in regard to the matter that you may wish, if any." Hill asked what was meant by riotous conduct and was told that it was "singing, hooting and throwing stones." Hill denied throwing any stones. He also said that he had been studying in his room when he heard the noise and had come down to where it was. When Hill was asked whether he "had anything further to say," he again denied throwing any stones. Hill later testified that he emphasized the statement that he had not thrown any stones, because that was the only disorder of any significance that occurred after he came out of his room. He also testified that he left the faculty thinking he was clear of the matter.

He was in error. After Hill's withdrawal, the faculty discussed the case and took action which was recorded in the minutes as follows: "The connection with Mr. Hill with the disorder of last Tuesday was considered, and whereas he was found connected with the said disorder in different ways: Resolved, That his further continuance in the college would be prejudicial to the order of the college and to the best interests of the students and that he therefore be dismissed from the college and be required to leave Carlisle within twenty-four hours, nem. con."

Hill was notified of this action the next day. He applied to the college treasurer for a refund of a proportionate share of the fees he had paid for the fall semester; they were refunded. Five days later, Hill wrote to President McCauley seeking reinstatement and stating his ability, "if necessary, to prove my innocence in a court of law." Receiving no reply within the time period set in his letter, Hill filed a petition for a writ of mandamus.

President Judge Sadler of the Court of Common Pleas of Cumberland County was sharply critical of the faculty's action. "Investigations such as this," said the Judge, "ought to be carried on in such a way as the experience of mankind has shown is most conducive to a just determination of the guilt or innocence of the party charged," that is, "in accordance with the principles of natural justice and the laws of the land." Specifically, (1) Hill should have been notified of the charge of misconduct made against him in such detail that he would realize its gravity and the harm which might come to him if the charge were sustained; (2) the testimony against him should have been given in his presence; (3) he should have been afforded a full opportunity to question adverse witnesses; and (4) he was entitled to call other witnesses to explain or contradict the testimony of the accusing witnesses.

The Judge also held that the proceeding was defective in that when Hill was brought before the faculty he was informed that the faculty was satisfied, persuaded or convinced of his connection with the riotous disturbance of the

week before. This deprived Hill of the "legal presumption in favor of innocence" and violated the rule that the burden of proof is on those who assert the accused's guilt.

The college contended that if the courts should hold the action of a faculty invalid in a case like the present there would be an end to all discipline in educational institutions, their efficiency would be greatly impaired, if not utterly destroyed, and the courts would be crowded with a new and innumerable class of suitors. Judge Sadler disposed of this argument in the following words:

"There need be no apprehension of such direful results from the declaration of the doctrine that the dismissal of students from colleges should be in accordance with those principles of justice...which are recognized as controlling in the determination of the rights of men in every civilized nation on the globe...

"The adoption of a lawful mode of procedure in the trial of students for offenses of so grave a character as may result in their dismissal or expulsion from advanced institutions of learning, and the insistence that guilt must be ascertained by competent evidence will not interfere with discipline. It will prevent the harm which so often may, and, no doubt, does result from professors placing reliance on the mistaken, prejudiced, false or malicious statements of the private informer. The feeling which students entertain toward such persons is not different from that which prevails in society at large. Permit the accused to meet his accuser face to face. Have it understood that testimony is given because exacted of the witness, and that it is not the voluntary information of the tale-bearer, and infamy will no longer attach in colleges to those who may give evidence against their fellows, nor will faculties meet extraordinary difficulties in discovering the truth. Nor, if such a practice were adopted, would it have any tendency to limit the patronage of the colleges and universities.

"Offenses, for the commission of which sentences of dismissal may be affixed, are not so frequent that it will impose any great hardship upon faculties to duly inquire into the guilt of the accused, nor will their action be so often questioned as to entail any considerable additional burdens on the courts." 11

The Judge also observed that although it was undoubtedly true that "the faculties of colleges are usually composed of exceptionally wise and good persons ...., the experience of mankind has long demonstrated the unwisdom of conferring absolute and irresponsible power upon any body of men, however estimable, except in extraordinary and unavoidable cases."

Finally, the Judge rejected the argument of the College -- which he said was advanced with "great earnestness

and warmth," -- that the relation between student and professor is similar to that existing between parent and child, and that there would be as much justification for interference by the courts with the discipline of the one as of the other.

It is perhaps anticlimactic to state that Judge Sadler concluded that since Hill was not given "such a trial as he was entitled to under the laws" of the state, his dismissal from the college was invalid.<sup>12</sup>

At the other extreme from Judge Sadler's decision and reasoning in the Dickinson College case is the opinion of Justice Sears of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York in *Anthony v. Syracuse University*. Syracuse University was incorporated under special act of the New York legislature; it was exempt from taxation and was subject to visitation by the Regents of the University of the State of New York.

Miss Beatrice O. Anthony, then seventeen or eighteen years old, enrolled in the home economic course at Syracuse in September 1923. At that time and in September of 1924, 1925, and 1926 when she registered for her second, third and fourth years, Miss Anthony signed a registration card which contained these words: "I agree in honor to comply with the regulations and requirements of Syracuse University and to cooperate with the University authorities and my fellow students in maintaining high standards of conduct and scholarship and in promoting the general welfare of the University. It is understood that I accept registration as a student in Syracuse University subject to the rule as to continuance therein found .... (on a specified page) of the University Catalogue." The rule referred to in the registration card and printed in the University was amended slightly in 1924 and from that time read as follows: "Attendance at the University is a privilege and not a right. In order to safeguard those ideals of scholarship and that moral atmosphere which are the very purpose of its founding and maintenance, the University reserves the right and the student concedes to the University the right to require the withdrawal of any student at any time for any reason deemed sufficient to it, and no reason for requiring such withdrawal need be given."

On October 6, 1926, Miss Anthony was dismissed from the University. Although Miss Anthony demanded to be informed of the reasons for her dismissal and an opportunity to be heard, she was told only that the University officials had heard rumors about her, that the officials had talked with several girls in her sorority house and had found that although she had done nothing lately, she had caused considerable trouble in the past, and that the officials did not think she was "a typical Syracuse girl." (Laughter)

Miss Anthony then brought an action to compel the University to reinstate her. The University defended on the ground that because of the statement in the registration card

and the rule printed in the Catalogue, the contract between the University and Miss Anthony authorized the University to dismiss her at any time for any cause whatever. The trial judge rejected this argument, discussed the right to notice and hearing in language similar to that used by Judge Sadler forty years before, held that the rule which purported to empower the University to dismiss a student without stating any reason was invalid because it was contrary to public policy, and ordered reinstatement.<sup>13</sup>

The University appealed, and the judgment of the trial judge was reversed.<sup>14</sup> Justice Sears, who wrote the appellate court's opinion, appeared to think the case was rather simple. He reasoned as follows. The parties voluntarily entered into a contract. A student is not required to enter the university and could, in fact, after entry withdraw without reason at any time. A university need not accept as a student one desiring to become such. "It may, therefore, limit the effect of such acceptance by express agreement and thus retain the position of contractual freedom in which it stood before the student's course was entered upon."

There is no reason why a student cannot agree that the institution may terminate the relations between them. "The contract between an institution and a student does not differ in this respect from contracts of employment." Therefore, the only significant question in the case is what are the terms on the contract. This requires an interpretation of the rule. Properly construed the rule does not give the University "an absolute right to dismiss .... for any reason whatever." It may only dismiss for reasons which relate to safeguarding the University's "ideals of scholarship" and "moral atmosphere." But although the University must have a reason for dismissal which relates either to scholarship or moral atmosphere, it need not state the reason. The student has the burden of proving that the reason for her dismissal was not within the terms of the regulation. Miss Anthony did not sustain that burden and therefore the judgment of the court below is reversed.

Perhaps it will be helpful at this point to recapitulate the polar positions. In the Dickinson College case, Judge Sadler insisted upon notice of the charges, confrontation, cross examination, rebuttal testimony, and presumption of innocence. In the Syracuse University case, Justice Sears and his colleagues, under the guise of applying orthodox contract law, permitted the institution to dismiss a student not only without affording any procedural safeguards but for undisclosed reasons. These are the extremes.

The remaining decisions cannot be classified into neat categories. Instead, they cover the spectrum between the two extremes and for the most part tend to reflect different judicial approaches or attitudes rather than sharp conflicts of legal principles or holdings.



The cases closest to Justice Sears' holding usually emphasize the institution's discretion in disciplinary matters, sometimes refer to the private character of the institution and to the existence of a bylaw or regulation authorizing dismissal, usually state that a "trial" or "sworn charges and an open hearing" are not required, and invariably conclude that the dismissal should be upheld.<sup>15</sup>

The cases in the second group resemble those in the first in that they also stress the institution's wide discretion and conclude that the dismissal in question should not be disturbed. But instead of summarily asserting that a trial is not required, these opinions go on and outline the procedural safeguards to which the student is entitled.

An illustrative statement is the following by the Supreme Court of Tennessee in a case involving students in the University of Tennessee College of Medicine who were expelled for having sold final examination questions to their fellow students:

"The College of Medicine .... will not be required to follow technical rules of procedure in bringing to trial students who have committed an offense against the institution. We think the student should be informed as to the nature of the charges, as well as the names of at least the principal witnesses against him when requested, and given a fair opportunity to make his defense. He cannot claim the privilege of cross examination as a matter of right. The testimony against him may be oral or written, not necessarily under oath, but he should be advised as to its nature, as well as the persons who have accused him. .... As to the right to meet his accusers face to face in an investigation of wrongdoing, we cannot fail to note that honorable students do not like to be known as snoopers and informers against their fellows, that it is most unpleasant even when it becomes a duty. In these circumstances they should not be subjected to a cross examination and, as is often seen in a trial court, to their displeasure if not their public humiliation."<sup>16</sup>

The distinctive feature of the few remaining cases in the spectrum is that unlike all of the other decisions, except Judge Sadler's, they hold the dismissal to be invalid because the student's procedural rights were violated. I only found three such cases. I won't say there are not more, but at least those were the ones I found.

Without question, the most significant decision in this final cluster of cases is *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*, decided in August 1961 by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.<sup>17</sup> The facts of that case are these.

After a "sit-in" at a publicly owned grill located in the county courthouse at Montgomery, Alabama, and other demonstrations in Montgomery and elsewhere, six Negro students

at the Alabama State College in Montgomery were expelled from the College. The students were not notified of any charges against them and they were not given any opportunity to be heard. Instead, each student received a letter from the President of the College notifying him that he had been expelled. The letter did not state the grounds for the recipient's expulsion; but it did refer to reports of "the various news media," and it is likely that the students knew their expulsion was related in some way to their alleged participation in the "sit-in" and other demonstrations.<sup>18</sup>

The students brought an action against the Board, the College and the President to restrain them from interfering with the students' attendance at the College. The federal district court, in disposing of the students' contention that their expulsion without formal charges and without an opportunity to be heard violated their rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, stated, "Where there is no statute or rule that requires formal charges and/or a hearing, as is the case in Alabama, the prevailing law does not require the presentation of formal charges or a hearing prior to expulsion ...."

The district court also reviewed the facts and concluded: "(1) the students' actions provoked "discord, disorder, disturbance and disruption" on the campus and in the classrooms; (2) the conduct of the students constituted insubordination, was prejudicial to the school, resulted in inciting other students to like conduct, and in general was unbecoming a student or future teacher; and (3) the defendants actions were taken in good faith and were necessary in order that the college could operation .... in a proper manner." The district court dismissed the action.<sup>19</sup>

The decision was reversed by the Court of Appeals in an opinion by Judge Rives, a highly respected and able member of the federal judiciary.<sup>20</sup> Relying on Supreme Court decisions involving the listing of subversive organizations, deportation of aliens, and exclusion of civilian employees from military installations, Judge Rives took as his text the proposition that "whenever a government body acts so as to injure an individual the Constitution requires that the act be consonant with due process of law." Judge Rives found the requisite injury as follows:

"It requires no argument to demonstrate that education is vital and, indeed, basic to civilized society. Without sufficient education the plaintiffs would not be able to earn an adequate livelihood, to enjoy life to the fullest, or to fulfill as completely as possible the duties and responsibilities of good citizens. .... It is most unlikely that a public college would accept a student expelled from another public college of the same state. Indeed, expulsion may well prejudice the student from completing his education at any other institution."<sup>21</sup>

The court rejected the argument advanced by the defendants, and apparently based on the reasoning of Justice Sears' opinion in *Anthony v. Syracuse University*, that the students had waived their right to notice and hearing, because a regulation of the State Board of Education published in the College Catalogue provided, "Just as a student may choose to withdraw from a particular college at any time for any personally-determined reason, the college may also at any time decline to continue to accept responsibility for the supervision and service to any student with whom the relationship becomes unpleasant and difficult." First, said the court, this provision does not clearly indicate an intent on the part of the student to waive notice and hearing, and, second, a state "cannot condition the granting of even a privilege upon the renunciation of the constitutional right to procedural due process."

The question that remained for Judge Rives was what does procedural due process demand. The court's answer was that this depends upon the circumstances and interests of the parties involved. The interest of the students in remaining in the college of their choice is of "extremely great value." Also, in student dismissal cases "there are no considerations of immediate danger to the public, or of peril to the national security, which should prevent the Board from giving the accused students notice of the charge and an opportunity to be heard in their own defense." The court concluded its opinion by stating its views concerning the nature of the notice and hearing required by due process. The intrinsic importance of the statement and the fact that it will be widely quoted and relied upon by other courts which may have similar cases in the future -- indeed it has already in another case in Tennessee -- justifies me, I think, even at the expense of the time involved, in reading you this rather lengthy quotation. This is Judge Rives statement, for the advice of the parties, this is the kind of hearing due process demands. Here it is:

" .... The notice should contain a statement of the specific charges and grounds which, if proven, would justify expulsion under the regulations of the Board of Education. The nature of the hearing should vary depending upon the circumstances of the particular case. The case before us requires something more than an informal interview with an administrative authority of the college. By its nature, a charge of misconduct, as opposed to a failure to meet the scholastic standards of the college, depends upon a collection of the facts concerning the charged misconduct, easily colored by the point of view of the witnesses. In such circumstances, a hearing which gives the Board or the administrative authorities of the college an opportunity to hear both sides in considerable detail is best suited to protect the rights of all involved.

"This is not to imply that a full-dress judicial hearing, with the right to cross examine witnesses, is required.

Such a hearing, with the attending publicity and disturbance of college activities, might be detrimental to the college's educational atmosphere and impractical to carry out. Nevertheless, the rudiments of an adversary proceeding may be preserved without encroaching upon the interests of the college.

"In the instant case, the student should be given the names of the witnesses against him and an oral or written report on the facts to which each witness testifies. He should also be given the opportunity to present to the Board, or at least to an administrative official of the college, his own defense against the charges and to produce either oral testimony or written affidavits of witnesses in his behalf. If the hearing is not before the Board directly, the results and findings of the hearing should be presented in a report open to the student's inspection. If these rudimentary elements of fair play are followed in a case of misconduct of this particular type, we feel that the requirements of due process of law will have been fulfilled."<sup>23</sup>

This, then, is what the courts have done. Judge Sadler's early clarion call has been muffled by a cacophony of opposing voices. Even his own supreme court has contributed to the discord. Although no court seems to have followed the literal approach of *Anthony v. Syracuse University*, the case has not been overruled, nor has its reasoning been explicitly rejected by any court. These courts which have ruled that the student should be given notice and opportunity to defend himself have not agreed with Judge Sadler concerning the nature of the hearing. Not even Judge Rives, whose opinion in the *Dixon* case is clearly the most able and impressive of all those written in this century, would require an opportunity for confrontation and cross examination; in addition, Judge Rives was most explicit in confining his holding an opinion to "public" institutions which are subject to the constraints of the Fourteenth Amendment that "No state .... shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law ...."

I turn now to the more difficult task of stating what I think courts will do in the future when dismissal or suspension procedures are challenged as contrary to law.

## II. WHAT COURTS MAY BE EXPECTED TO DO IN THE FUTURE

It is appropriate at the outset of this endeavor that I state my own deeply held preferences concerning procedural safeguards when vital personal interests are at stake. For although one may strive to be objective, there is danger that in defining a broad concept like "due process of law" or "fair hearing" one will be influenced by his own convictions. It is only fair, therefore, that you know my views or, if you will, my predilections. In a word, I agree completely with Judge Sadler. In several more words, I believe that when vital personal interests are at stake, the official who is to

act should be fully informed concerning the factual bases of his proposed action; that the person whose interests are directly involved is uniquely qualified to assist in the development and verification of the needed data; and that when the decision hinges on controverted facts relating to past events, the methods of a trial -- principally notice of the charges, confrontation, cross examination, rebuttal testimony, and decision on the record by an unbiased tribunal -- will be a superior means for discovering falsehood and correcting unwarranted inferences.

I would also underscore Justice Robert Jackson's admonition that "due process of law is not for the sole benefit of the accused. It is the best insurance for the Government against those blunders which leave lasting stains on a system of justice which are bound to occur in an ex parte consideration."<sup>25</sup>

Having thus expressed my faith in the adversary system as a means of achieving fair and enlightening decisions, let me add two important qualifications. First, the methods of a trial are not appropriate for resolving some issues. Thus, if an institutional regulation provides for suspension whenever a student is indicted for a felony, insistence that the fact of indictment be ascertained only after opportunity for confrontation, cross examination and rebuttal testimony would be doctrinaire in the extreme. Similarly, the methods of a trial would be a wasteful and inefficient means for ascertaining whether a student has achieved the grade average required for continuing in the institution.

Second, due process is a flexible conception whose content will vary in light of the circumstances and interests of the parties involved. Also, due process imposes procedural minima; it does not demand the best possible procedure. Extreme care must be exercised, therefore, not to fall into the trap of equating the requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment with one's personal views of desirable procedure.

The concepts of due process and fair hearing are shaped in significant part by tradition, usage, and stare decisis. But as one of our ablest contemporary jurists, Justice Roger J. Traynor of the California Supreme Court, reminds us in terms reminiscent of Cardozo, "Courts have a creative job to do when they find that a rule has lost touch with reality and should be abandoned or reformulated to meet new conditions and new moral values."<sup>26</sup>

Recognizing, then, my own preference for Judge Sadler's approach and bearing in mind both the flexibility of due process and the competing demands of creativity and continuity in the development of law, I venture the following predictions.

1. Courts may be expected to become more sensitive to the demands of procedural regularity in student dismissal

proceedings, because: (a) As a higher percentage of the population attends colleges and universities and as the nation's economy calls for more and more specialization, the value and significance of higher education to the individual becomes increasingly greater. (b) It is becoming harder and harder to secure admission to the institution of one's choice and, therefore, dismissal involves a harsher sanction than in the assertedly good old days when one could get his education by being "thrown out of the best colleges in the country." (c) In other areas of the law in recent years courts have been particularly sensitive to the importance of fair procedure when vital interests, particularly reputation, have been at stake, and this procedural concern undoubtedly will in time have an effect on the manner in which the judiciary decides student dismissal cases.

My second prediction is: The courts will insist that state-financed institutions give the student notice of the charges and an opportunity to defend himself. The Dixon case will become a leading case in the field, and Judge Rives' prescription of the kind of notice and hearing to be given will, in general, be followed. Although Judge Rives specifically stated that a full-dress, judicial hearing, with the right to cross examine witnesses was not required, because such a hearing, "with the attending publicity and disturbance of college activities, might be detrimental to the college's educational atmosphere and impractical to carry out," I do not believe that this will prevent courts from holding that confrontation and cross examination are required in certain circumstances.

If, for example, in a dismissal proceeding involving alleged cheating, it develops that the decision will depend upon whether the tribunal believes the accused or his accusers, confrontation and cross examination should be required, because these are the methods which long experience has shown are the best assurance of fair and enlightened action. Please note the circumscribed character of this proposal. It is only when confrontation and cross examination are the conditions of enlightened action that they should be required by the judiciary. Lawyers who represent dismissed students would do well to accept this approach, for in the present state of the law, judges -- even a judge as perceptive as Judge Rives -- will not be impressed with a broadside argument that a student must be given a trial-type hearing before he is dismissed. Indeed, in every case, counsel for the student should endeavor to convince the court that the procedural safeguards he demands are needed not because of some abstract right to due process or to a fair hearing but because his client has been prejudiced by their denial.

Prediction three: Regulations or bylaws of state-financed institutions that purport to authorize summary dismissal either will be interpreted not to confer such an authority or will be held to be unconstitutional or ultra vires.

4. Judges may for a time continue to distinguish between "public" and "private" colleges and universities. But I believe that they will come to recognize that from the standpoint of procedural fairness there is no sound reason for distinguishing between the student who attends, say, Stanford rather than California, Northwestern rather than Illinois, Duke rather than North Carolina, or Harvard rather than Massachusetts.<sup>27</sup>

It is true, of course, that the Fourteenth Amendment provision that "No State .... shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law" limits "state" rather than "private" action. Although the concept of "state" action is in the process of a development that eventually may make the due process limitations of the Fourteenth Amendment applicable to dismissal proceedings conducted by so-called "private" colleges and universities, that development has not yet come to fruition. But the federal constitution is not the only, or even the principal, source of law. State courts have ample power both to require procedural fairness in dismissal proceedings and to limit or, if necessary, to invalidate regulations or bylaws of "private" institutions that purport to authorize summary dismissal or otherwise restrict the student's right to a fair hearing.<sup>28</sup> This, in my confident opinion, is an area in which, in the long run, creative judges like Cardozo, Traynor, and Rives will cautiously but surely develop the law to the end that students in "private" colleges and universities will be accorded the same safeguards as their counterparts in "public" institutions.<sup>29</sup>

5. Finally, there should be a mention of the problem of waiver. What will courts do if the student does not request the opportunity to confront or question his accusers or to examine the information they have provided? Will they rule that a failure to request or object constitutes a waiver of the error, or will they hold that it is the responsibility of the tribunal to see to it that the student is given the type of hearing that fairness demands?<sup>30</sup> Although I cannot state with any confidence that the courts would so hold, it is clear to me that if the student is not represented by counsel, the burden of assuring a fair hearing should be placed on the institution.<sup>31</sup>

These remarks might well end at this point, for in describing what courts have done and in stating what I think they will do in the future, I have about exhausted my experience as a lawyer. I hope, however, that you will not think it presumptuous if I now leave the courts and venture a very short distance into the universe of academic administration, a world in which you, rather than I, have particular competence.

### III. WHAT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES SHOULD DO

My lack of experience in affairs of student discipline

bespeaks of circumspection in suggesting procedures that colleges and universities might observe when suspending or dismissing students. I shall not, therefore, propose a detailed procedural code for adoption by interested institutions. Instead, I shall make one categorical assertion, advance several general suggestions concerning desirable procedures, and conclude with a brief mention of a few problems which to my uninitiated mind appear significant but which your experience may indicate do not warrant consideration.

The categorical statement is taken from the dissenting opinion of Justice Galen in the Montana suspension case of *Ingersoll v. Clapp*, "A case of this character (i.e., one in which the student was suspended without a fair hearing) should never be before the courts and would not therein be given serious consideration were administrative officers disposed to perform their simple duty in the premises."<sup>32</sup> My conception of the proper performance of "their simple duty in the premises" is as follows:

1. The student should be given written notice of the specific charges and grounds which, if proved, would justify suspension or dismissal.
2. The notice should state that if the student so requests he will be given a hearing at which he may be represented by a person of his choice.
3. The nature of the hearing should depend upon the circumstances of the case. The procedure should be such as to enlighten the tribunal concerning the facts at issue. In some instances it would be sufficient to permit the student to submit evidence or argument challenging the charges and grounds stated in the notice. In other instances the names and statements of accusing witnesses should be furnished, and in still others, there should be confrontation and cross examination. There should be an opportunity to submit oral and written argument. A record of the hearing should be kept by a stenographer furnished by the institution.
4. A decision should be reached on the basis of the statement of charges and grounds and evidence adduced at the hearing. The student should be given written notice of the decision and reasons therefor.
5. If possible, there should be an unbiased appellate tribunal to which the student could appeal.

If colleges and universities will comply with these rather simple requirements, courts will not intervene. But mere avoidance of judicial intervention is not a very lofty aspiration for institutions of higher learning in a society which rightly emphasizes the dignity of the individual. The question that remains, then, is whether there are safeguards --



in addition to those that the law requires -- which should be provided by the institution. Let me close these already too extended remarks by listing some possibly relevant queries.

How should the pre-hearing investigation and interviews be conducted? Should the suspected student be fully informed concerning the information the institution has assembled or should he be told in general terms that he is suspected and be asked to make a statement? Should he be permitted to have a friend or representative present at the pre-hearing interview? If the student fails or refuses to answer questions, what inferences may be drawn? Should the institution inform the student concerning his procedural rights and if so, in how much detail?

Should the institution recommend, or in some cases provide, counsel? May the official who conducted the initial investigation participate in the ultimate decision? To what extent should representatives of the study body participate in disciplinary proceedings? Should there be a procedure for disqualifying allegedly prejudiced decisional officials? Under what circumstances will summary suspension pending a hearing be justified? To what extent should "voluntary" resignations be encouraged? Should reports of psychiatrists or social workers be utilized and if so, should copies be furnished the student? What should be done if the hearing officials become convinced that the student has lied -- should he be summarily dismissed for lying or should there be an additional hearing to determine whether in fact he did lie and if so what sanction should be imposed?

And finally, although it may not be directly related to procedure, what about the vital and difficult problem of sanctions? What purposes are served by expulsion, suspension, rustication, reprimand, or other sanction -- deterrence, retribution, rehabilitation, maintenance of the integrity of the educational process, other?

The answers to these questions will be found neither in law reports nor in statute books but in the minds and in the hearts of the men and women who are responsible for administering student discipline in American institutions of higher learning. Theirs is a heavy responsibility. In discharging it they should heed the advice of that most distinguished student of American freedoms, the late Zechariah Chafee, Jr., "An institution which professes to prepare youth for life in a democracy might wisely give them an example of fair play when it is conducting its own affairs."<sup>33</sup>

Thank you. (Prolonged applause)

---

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Holmes, Collected Legal Papers 171 (1920). The entire passage reads as follows: "If you want to know the law and

nothing else, you must look at it as a bad man, who cares only for the material consequences which such knowledge enables him to predict, not as a good one, who finds his reasons for conduct, whether inside the law or outside of it, in the vaguer sanctions of conscience."

2. Id. at 173.

3. Id. at 174.

4. Fuller, *The Law in Quest of Itself* 137 (1940).

5. Cardozo, *The Nature of the Judicial Process* 167 (1921).

6. Id. at 165.

7. Id. at 149, 150.

8. Id. at 161-162.

9. Keeton, *Creative Continuity in the Law of Torts*, 75 Harv. L. Rev. 463 (1962).

10. *Commonwealth ex rel. Hill v. McCauley*, 3 Pa. C.C. Rep. 77 (C.P. Cumberland Cy. 1887).

11. Id. at 87, 88.

12. Hill never was reinstated. He had applied for and was refunded a proportionate share of the fees he had paid for the fall semester. The College argued that this amounted to a voluntary severance of his connection with the College. Judge Sadler reserved the point for later decision. But Hill apparently never pressed the point. See J.M. Morgan, *History of Dickinson College* 353-354 (1933), for a discussion of the Hill case. Professor Morgan (who was a member of the faculty at the time of the Hill affair) reports: "(Since Hill) had accepted the return of part of his college fee . . . , the Court . . . (held) under advisement the question of his reinstatement. So the case continued to stand, and stands to this day. This, of course, made appeal to the higher courts impossible, as there was no final decision." I am indebted to Gilbert Malcom, the Provost of Dickinson College, for this reference.

13. *Anthony v. Syracuse University*, 130 Misc. 249, 259, 223 N.Y.S. 796, 808-809 (S.Ct. Onondaga Cy. 1927): "When as in this instance, a student demands to know the reason why (he is to be dismissed), thereby challenging the existence of any grounds for the claim that he has failed to safeguard 'ideals of scholarship' and 'moral atmosphere' of the institution, and asks to be given an opportunity to state his side of the case, if there be a case against him, before he is deprived of valuable rights, that student is entitled to the elementary right of notice and opportunity to be heard. This element of notice lies at the very basis of the condemnation of property;

and much more inherently does it lie at the basis of what is tantamount to an impairment of reputation. Given that opportunity, in the presence of admitted or established facts, the court would hesitate long before it would interfere with the discretion of the University; but here we have no facts, nothing but a dismissal 'in order to safeguard those ideals of scholarship and that moral atmosphere which are the very purpose' of the founding of the University. The position taken by the defendant is fraught with such obvious perils that it seems unnecessary to recite them; but what a field for rumor, for malice, for prejudice, for falsehood to roam in, leading to conduct on the part of the University which might be entirely honest but at the same time based upon a total lack or misapprehension of facts!"

14. *Anthony v. Syracuse University*, 224 App. Div. 487, 231 N.Y.S. 796 (4th Dept. 1928).

15. *Barker v. Bryn Mawr College*, 278 Pa. 121, 122 A. 220 (1923); *John B. Stetson University v. Hunt*, 88 Fla. 510, 102 So. 637 (1924); *Woods v. Simpson*, 146 Md. 547, 126 A 882 (1924); *White v. Portia Law School*, 274 Mass. 162, 174 N.E. 187 (1931), cert. denied, 288 U.S. 611 (1933); *People ex rel. Bluett v. Board of Trustees*, 10 Ill.App.2d 207, 134 N.E.2d 635, 58 A.L.R.2d 899 (1956), criticized in Seavey, *Dismissal of Students: "Due Process,"* 70 Harv. L. Rev. 1406 (1957); *Dehann v. Brandeis University*, 150 F.Supp. 626 (D.Mass. 1957), discussed in Comment, *A Student's Right to Hearing On Dismissal from a University*, 10 Stan. L. Rev. 746 (1958); *Robinson v. University of Miami*, 100 So.2d 442 (3d Dist. Ct. App. 1958). For additional citations and discussion, see Annot., *Right of Student to Hearing on Charges before Suspension or Expulsion from Educational Institution*, 58 A.L.R.2d 903 (1958); Blackwell, *The College Disciplinary Committee and the Courts*, in Blackwell, *Current Legal Problems of Colleges and Universities 1949-50*, p. 29; Blackwell, *College Law 123-127* (1960); Note, *Expulsion of Students from Private Educational Institutions*, 35 Colum. L. Rev. 898 (1935). And see Chafee, *The Internal Affairs of Associations Not for Profit*, 43 Harv. L. Rev. 993, 1026-1027 (1930).

16. *State ex rel. Sherman v. Hyman*, 180 Tenn. 99, 109-110, 171 S.W.2d 822, 826 (1942), cert. denied, 319 U.S. 748 (1943), criticized by Seavey, *supra* note 15 at 1408; *Koblitz v. Western Reserve University*, 21 O.C.C. 144, 11 Ohio C.D. 515 (Cuyahoga Cy. 1901); *Goldstein v. New York University*, 78 N.Y.S. 739, 76 App.Div. 80 (App. Div. 1st Dept. 1902); *Tanton v. McKenney*, 226 Mich. 245, 197 N.W. 510, 33 A.L.R. 1175 (1924); *State ex rel. Ingersoll v. Clapp*, 81 Mont. 200, 263 P. 433, cert. denied, 277 U.S. 591, error dism., 278 U.S. 661 (1928).

See also *University of Ceylon v. Fernando*, (1960) 1 All E.R. 631, discussed in de Smith, *University Discipline and Natural Justice*, 23 Mod. L. Rev. 428 (1960). Compare *The*

King v. Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, 2 Raym. Ld. 1334, 1338, 92 Eng. Rep. 370, 378 (K.B. 1723), in which the court issued a mandamus ordering the University to restore to a master the academic degree of which he had been deprived. The Lord Chief Justice said, "This Court will relieve him, if he has been proceeded against and degraded, without being heard, which is contrary to natural justice. This case therefore will fall under the rules for the removing of members of corporations, which cannot be done without summoning the party, and giving him an opportunity of being heard." And see Pennypacker, Mandamus to Restore Academic Privileges, 12 Va. L. Rev. 645 (1926).

17. 294 F.2d 150, cert. denied, 368 U.S. 930 (1961), discussed in 75 Harv. L. Rev. (1962). See also Knight v. State Board of Education, 200 F.Supp. 174 (M.D. Tenn. 1961) (regulation of the State Board of Education directed the dismissal of "any student in the institution .... who shall, in the future, be arrested and convicted on charges involving personal misconduct;" Negro students from the Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University traveled by interstate bus to Jackson, Mississippi, where they entered the waiting room of the bus terminal; when they refused to leave the terminal pursuant to an order from a local police officer, they were arrested and later convicted of violating a Mississippi Code which provides, "Whoever with intent to provoke a breach of the peace or under circumstances that such a breach of the peace may be occasioned thereby crowds or congregates with others in or upon .... (named public places) and who fails or refuses to move on, or disperse ....., when ordered to do so by any law enforcement officer .... shall be guilty of disorderly conduct;" the University suspended the students without notice or hearing at a time when the students were still in jail in Mississippi pending attempts to post bonds for appeals: held, "personal misconduct within the meaning of the regulation is conduct which reflects dishonor and discredit upon the institution; the students are entitled to a hearing before the University officials to determine whether the charges upon which they were convicted involved conduct covered by the regulation); Baltimore University v. Colton, 98 Md. 623, 57 A. 14 (1904) (writ of mandamus ordering reinstatement granted; dictum to effect that lack of notice is sufficient ground for invoking aid of mandamus.)

18. The letter contained a copy of a regulation of the State Board of Education which stated four general grounds for expelling students. One of the grounds, which was printed in capitals in the copy of the regulation received by the students, reads as follows: "For conduct prejudicial to the school and for conduct unbecoming a student or future teacher in schools of Alabama, for insubordination and insurrection, or for inciting other students to like conduct." It should be noted that the Court of Appeals found that the "misconduct for which the students were expelled has never been definitely specified." 294 F.2d at 151.

19. Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 186 F. Supp. 945 (M.D.Ala.N.D. 1960).
20. Judge Wisdom concurred with Judge Rives. Judge Cameron dissented. The Supreme Court later denied certiorari, 368 U.S. 930 (1961).
21. 294 F.2d at 157.
22. See, e.g., Knight v. State Board of Education, 200 F. Supp. 174, 182 (M.D.Tenn.N.D. 1961).
23. 294 F.2d at 158-159.
24. Barker v. Bryn Mawr College, 278 Pa. 121, 122 A. 220 (1923), supra note 15
25. Dissenting in Shaugnessy v. United States ex rel. Mezei, 354 U.S. 206, 224-225 (1953).
26. Traynor, Law and Social Change in a Democratic Society, 1956 Ill. Law Forum 230, 232.
27. Professor Chafee has pointed out that the "pecuniary consequences of dismissal from a private school or college are less severe than those of dismissal from a public school or state university." Chafee, The Internal Affairs of Associations Not for Profit, 43 Harv. L. Rev. 993, 1022 (1930). Although the extent of the pecuniary harm will be different in the two situations, I do not believe that this difference is sufficiently significant to justify different kinds of dismissal procedures in the two types of institutions.
28. See Chafee, supra note 27; Seavey, Dismissal of Students: "Due Process," 70 Harv. L. Rev. 1406 (1957) Summers, The Law of Union Discipline: What the Courts Do in Fact, 70 Yale L. J. 175 (1960).
29. I include Judge Rives in this group with full recognition that in his Dixon opinion he distinguished Anthony v. Syracuse University on the ground that it involved a private university and followed "the well-settled rule that the relations between a student and a private university are a matter of contract." 294 F.2d at 157. But this statement was neither necessary to his opinion nor essential to the holding in the case. It is what we lawyers call obiter dictum which I am confident Judge Rives would disclaim in an appropriate case.
30. See, e.g., University of Ceylon v. Fernando, (1960) All E. R. 631, 642, in which Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that the institution's failure to suggest to the student that he might wish to question the accusing witness was not sufficient to invalidate the proceedings. This part of the opinion of the Judicial Committee is criticized by Professor S. A. de Smith in University Discipline and Natural Justice, 23 Mod. L. Rev. 428, 430-431 (1960).

31. See Gellhorn and Byse, Administrative Law Cases and Comments 302, 306-308, 313 (1954).

32. 81 Mont. at 220, 263 P. at 439, supra note 16.

33. Chafee, supra note 27 at 1027.

---

CHAIRMAN GRIP: Mr. Byse, I think that applause speaks for itself.

DEAN NOWOTNY: Could I ask him one question? I like that summary, and I want to add one thing.

CHAIRMAN GRIP: Would you wait just one moment? We are going to have questions in a minute. Do you have to leave? (Laughter)

DEAN NOWOTNY: No.

CHAIRMAN GRIP: Just a minute, "Shorty." I feel an obligation here, "Shorty." I have asked three people here to comment on this thing briefly before we have questions. Let me tell you, Professor Byse, knowing that crowds sometimes do not pop up with questions, and not knowing what we knew in advance this morning, that this one would be primed for you, we invited three people to sit here and to think about this in advance. These men are John Hocutt, of the University of Delaware, Warren Shirley, from Florida A&M, and Louis Stamatakis, from the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee.

If "Shorty" will hold his question for a moment, I will ask each of these gentlemen if they will comment briefly on this paper. John Hocutt.

DEAN JOHN HOCUTT: First of all, I think I should correct the record. At the outset, Carl Grip suggested that I had been involved in some four court cases in the last four years. Lest this gives you cause to question my responsibility as an administrator, I think I should point out that actually these were threats of legal action which did not materialize in court cases. In recent years, I have been in court on only one occasion, and this involved my being subpoenaed as a witness by a defense attorney who was defending three former students of the institution, and I was directed to appear in court with various university confidential records. Our attorney told me that I had to go and that I had to take these records. I was quite concerned about the prospect of revealing these confidential records in court.

As things turned out, I had no more to do than to give my name, rank, and serial number (laughter) and the rest of my time on the witness stand was spent listening to the opposing attorneys debate at the side bar, if that is the

proper term, and the judge upheld the objections made by the opposing attorney to questions put to me.

If you will pardon that lengthy explanation, I did want to set the record straight.

I found myself listening so intently to Professor Byse that I did not take all the notes that perhaps I should have. You did make it quite clear, I believe, sir, that there is quite a difference between a dismissal when a student fails to meet certain academic standards of the institution and when the dismissal takes place because of misconduct of some sort. I still have a question in this area. It seems to me, and I have no legal training or background, but it seems to me that a student might even question due process or failure to be afforded the opportunity to due process in an academic dismissal. He might challenge whether or not his instructors had been unfair or prejudiced in their grading. He might even question the academic standards of the institution, whether they are fair.

I have one other question in this general area. I think all of us, on occasions, have had cases in a gray zone that might have been classified as disciplinary, but for one reason or another were referred to the medical officers of the institution, and the university physician may, in such a case, recommend that the student be required to withdraw from the institution for medical reasons.

We have been accepting such advice and notifying the student that he is required to withdraw for medical reasons, and I am a little uneasy about this, after hearing this excellent address this morning, as to whether or not some hearing should be involved here because I do know of some of these cases which have been -- which might very well have been called disciplinary, but for certain reasons were referred to the university physician.

I have a couple of other minor questions as to detail. I wonder if in disciplinary hearings we are to allow the defendant student to be represented by counsel, and I assume that this may mean legal counsel, should the institution or the disciplinary committee or judicial group, whatever it may be, should it also be represented by counsel? You referred to the necessity of keeping a record of the proceedings. Does this mean that we should have a word for word transcript, or may a secretary take such notes as he thinks are appropriate? I am concerned about the matter of taking testimony on the assumption that witnesses appearing are going to speak honestly. This question was referred to yesterday and whether, so far as I know, we may not place witnesses under oath. They may be admonished that they are expected to tell the truth, but they do not give testimony under oath.

These are some of the questions I had, Professor Byse.

PROFESSOR BYSE: I suppose there is a possibility that a student, especially if the courts are more receptive to entertaining suits on procedural ground, that there is a possibility that a litigious student, or a lawyer, might challenge whether the instructor has given him a fair grade, or whether or not the grading system is fair. I would suppose that in practically all of these cases they would be given the back of the judicial hand, that it is just impossible for a court to re-examine the grading system. I would not exclude a case which might happen where there was actual prejudice. This would take an almost superhuman burden of proof. But if a student could maintain it, and could really prove it, by clear and convincing evidence, with all the safeguards, I would not object to having someone move in.

I am sure the courts would say, the first thing you have to do is that you say the teacher gave you a poor grade, and you have to go to the dean, or the president, and exhaust your remedies within the institution. If this then were examined and the dean or the other groups said there was nothing to it, I would doubt very much that the court would find both the teacher and the reviewing group being prejudiced. It is conceivable -- there have been allegations. I have received them in various capacities, particularly with respect to graduate students. Some of them, on their surface, made quite an appealing case. I do not think the courts are apt to move in. If you do get arbitrary enough, I think they would, and they should. But I doubt that this is much of a problem.

The second problem about the medical officers, it does seem to me is an exceedingly difficult question. I recall having had a couple of such cases myself, that is, as a member of a faculty. My own feeling is that a proper procedure in that event is usually, because the person is ill, or disturbed, or whatever, that in such a case if you can present the question, "Well, shouldn't he withdraw to his parent, or adviser, or something?" that then a decision can be made by that individual, presumably rationally; and they almost always would withdraw.

Let us take the case where a student does not have any parent, and so on. Here he is; he is emotionally disturbed, to state it mildly. He has done something which would be the subject of discipline and, probably, you said, you ought to go see the psychiatrist; and the psychiatrist then reports and says, "Look, this boy is a schizophrenic, and so on, and he really needs treatment, and the best thing is to get him out of your institution." So then what do you do?

Well, you obviously suggest to him he should resign. Maybe he does. Or you can just put him on leave. The crucial question is now, do you have to have some kind of a hearing? All I can say is I do not think I would be inclined, in the kind of case I have given, to have a hearing. What good is



a hearing going to be to this fellow, who is so disturbed emotionally that he should be removed and given treatment? If there is somebody who should act for him, a parent or so forth, they should be informed and given an opportunity. You know, psychiatrists do make mistakes. Of course, none that we deal with, maybe. But if this report is erroneous, there should be some opportunity, perhaps. So I would say that you ought to notify the parent, and if there is no parent it is a very tough case.

In one case we had just such a situation, and I must say I dissented on it. He was dismissed, and that is all there was to it. It probably was a fair thing. I thought it would have been a little better to have had some sort of an opportunity to have a chance for him, or his representative, in some way to say, "Well, that report is wrong. Sure I look up at the ceiling a thousand times, like Hiss did -- and so did the psychiatrist -- but that is just a tick. Nothing wrong with me." (Laughter)

But it is a tough case and I don't suppose my answer is very satisfactory; but some way be sure that you are not making a mistake, in not placing too much reliance on the psychiatric analysis. That doesn't make you very happy, I guess.

If the student is represented by counsel, should the committee have counsel? Somebody said last night that in 95 out of 100 -- I suppose that would be 99 out of 100 -- you have the information, "Yes, I did it. I shouldn't have done it, but I did it." And the question becomes one of treatment. The case I am talking about is where he says, "No, I did not do it." And then you have to ascertain these facts.

In that case, it seems to me that if the student is represented by counsel, I would pass -- this is a very good answer and it just came to me -- I would pass that question on to the counsel of your university, and not to me. (Laughter) What does he think about it? He knows your situation better than I do. He may know the lawyer for the student. I would ask him.

If I were counsel for a university, I would say, "Well, Dean, in some cases yes, and in some cases no." You would have to tell me a little bit about the cases. Not in every case are you going to have a lawyer here. All you are trying to do is ascertain the truth. If you have this "sea lawyer" really making objections and so on, maybe I ought to be there just to help you a little bit, but it will depend, and I do not think this is going to make the legal profession rich on fees from universities.

What is meant by a record? Well, I think if you get down to an issue in which there are controverted statements and issues -- for instance, a case in which the issue is: Did he cheat or not? And one says "Yes," and the other

says, "No," and it resolves on who you believe. I would like to have this gentleman right there, sitting there taking it all down. Now, again, you are not going to have many such cases. Most times, I suppose it will be a matter of what the sanction is, in which event I wouldn't suppose you would have to have more than some record.

This last point really bothers me very much -- much more than any of the others. The Dean says he is concerned about the assumption that student witnesses will be honest. They are not under oath. Well now, he knows students better than I do. Is he concerned with the assumption that student witnesses will not be honest when they are not under oath, talking to him in his office? Is there any more reason to think that you will get truth by ex parte not under oath testimony than by testimony which is before a group and also not under oath?

Secondly, what is there to this "under oath"? I would suppose -- I may be wrong -- that most people tell the truth because to tell the truth is the right thing. And if they do not tell the truth in serious matters they are not going to be deterred by a bible. I may be wrong. This may not be true in some religious schools. I will suppose that one could ask them to take an oath on a bible, for whatever form or Divine sanction that this may imply to the individual. But I think what is meant is that you do not have the sanctions of perjury that you will go to jail if you tell a lie. But again, I cannot see the difference between testimony outside the hearing or inside the hearing, as far as the assumption of honesty or dishonesty.

DEAN HOCUTT: What I meant is, really, should this be a part of the procedure?

PROFESSOR BYSE: You mean, should you make them take an oath?

DEAN HOCUTT: I don't think so, myself.

PROFESSOR BYSE: I would doubt it myself, but I know very little about these things. I will tell the truth, I think, I hope, most of the time because it is the right thing to do. Then you come in and say, "Byse, you are going to have to take an oath." "Who are you?" "I'm Dean Hocutt." "Take an oath? You're not an official of the state. You don't have authority to administer an oath." "Well, you take it anyway, and that will make you tell the truth a little more."

I just don't like it, and I think students would feel the same way. I would assume that people on the whole are decent and honest until proved otherwise.

CHAIRMAN GRIP: I think it is important that we point out that Dean Hocutt was a little appalled at having to have

an oath. I think he is on the same side of the fence.

The next speaker is Warren Shirley.

DEAN WARREN SHIRLEY (Florida A&M University): I am going to relinquish my time for questions from the floor. (Applause)

DEAN LOUIS STAMATAKOS (University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee): After that what can I say? (Laughter) I do have one question, and I think it would probably be asked by someone from the floor anyway. Would you care to comment on the advisability of an institution's publication of a statement concerning the university's philosophy on student conduct. Is this necessary? Or, for that matter, is this good? Or should it be required?

PROFESSOR BYSE: One theory: It is always desirable to have stated what the rules are. But what are the rules for being a decent person? I just don't know. My own view on something I do know something about -- I really do not know much about student discipline -- about discharge of a tenure teacher. I think probably the best rule is a broad one, "just cause" or something like that. At the same time, I can see that a student says, "I would like to know what it is." I am afraid I just don't have an answer. In theory you cannot take issue with it. You should state what they are, and certainly if there are debatable issues; but you do not have to have a rule that you don't cheat in examinations. You do not have to have a rule that you don't steal, and so on. When you get to the more debatable issues I would suppose that you should have a rule, not only for warning, but also in hammering out by the proper groups as to what the rule of conduct would be.

So I guess my answer to your question is that as to any debatable matters you probably should spell it out as best you can; but that in the main, it seems to me that from the kind of cases we are mostly concerned with, there is not much question of what is right and wrong. There is a question of what was done, why it was done, and what the sanction should be. That is not a very good answer, I guess.

DEAN STAMATAKOS: It is a little vague.

PROFESSOR BYSE: Well, what do you want to know?

DEAN STAMATAKOS: For example, what I was driving at, should the university make a statement to this effect: That students' conduct, on and off campus, that brings discredit to the institution shall be considered serious enough to warrant disciplinary action or a disciplinary hearing?

PROFESSOR BYSE: I don't like that "discredit to the institution" because I don't know what that means. I do not believe that is a rule at all. I believe that is a pious

statement. You talk about me being general! (Laughter)  
What does that mean?

CHAIRMAN GRIP: I am going to recognize the senior member from the State of Texas, "Shorty."

DEAN NOWOTNY: I like the summary. I would add one thing to his summary, and that is in all cases students should be told before the trial to have their parents present, if possible, and to notify them. That is all the counsel some of these students should have and need.

The thing that disturbs me is this statement about a student who has been indicted and whether he should be suspended or not suspended until he is found guilty or acquitted.

PROFESSOR BYSE: Two comments were made. One was that the senior senator from Texas would add that the student's parents should be informed and be present at the hearing, and in many cases, this is all the representation he would need. I don't know. Again, I do not have the feel of how you treat students. In a sense they are adults, and you are training them to be adults, and trying to develop their independence; and on the other hand, they are somebody's kids and they get into a jam. I know I would want to go if my child did, and I am inclined to agree that that is a good suggestion, that they should be informed.

Then he said, what about this problem I raised of suspending a student while there is a pending hearing? Do I like that or do I dislike that?

DEAN NOWOTNY: If they are indicted for a felony.

PROFESSOR BYSE: Oh, if he is indicted for a felony should he be suspended? Is it my judgment that it is proper or improper? Is that your question?

DEAN NOWOTNY: Yes, sir.

PROFESSOR BYSE: Well, I was on a faculty once when such a case was involved, and my position was that an indictment did not mean anything more than he had been indicted, and he should continue to go, to be permitted to go. Fortunately, it never came up because he withdrew on his own accord. My own view would be that he be permitted to continue, that the presumption of innocence still applies. If the indictment was for a felony which involved some criminal, particularly flagrant, action on campus, it might be a different thing. So I would not vote for such a rule, but I could easily see where somebody would disagree with me on that.

Does that answer your question, sir?

DEAN NOWOTNY: Yes.

PROFESSOR BYSE: Anybody else?

DEAN JAMES E. FOY: Mr. Byse, if the authority of the institution can be brought into question by the courts in the matter of dismissing a student for disciplinary reasons, could it not also be brought to bear in the case of an institution which does not choose to give admission to a student due to his high school disciplinary record if due process was not involved?

PROFESSOR BYSE: Yes, I think particularly in a state institution. As a matter of fact, it is already done. State institutions cannot refuse admission on the grounds of color.

DEAN FOY: I said "disciplinary reasons."

PROFESSOR BYSE: Disciplinary reasons. You mean to refuse a man admission because he is a bad fellow?

DEAN FOY: Yes.

PROFESSOR BYSE: And the university says, "And the reason we are not admitting you is that you are a fellow we don't like," and the student says, "Well, I have a right to come," and he institutes an action for mandamus. I suppose in a state university if you could show that the reason was clearly arbitrary, improper, that there wasn't anything to the alleged misconduct, conceivably a court would take jurisdiction and order admission. It is not a very likely case.

CHAIRMAN GRIP: We have time for one more question. We have time, unfortunately, for only one more question. Mr. Nygreen informs me that the luncheons are ready. Who stands tallest?

DEAN THOMAS L. BROADBENT: I wanted to tie that down, this previous question, by asking if a student has been dismissed for disciplinary reasons, and it shows on his transcript, I suppose we would not be expected then to accept him?

CHAIRMAN GRIP: The question is: If a student has been dismissed from another institution and the transcript shows this dismissal, should the second institution accept it or ignore it?

PROFESSOR BYSE: The answer, I think, is quite clear. If a man has been dismissed from one institution and another says, "We are not going to take you because of that," period, I cannot conceive of a court saying, "We are going to decide whether that is right or wrong." You have great discretion, as you know, and this is only just one fact.

... Conference announcements ...

CHAIRMAN GRIP: Mr. Byse, we thank you very much.  
(Applause)

... The conference recessed at twelve-fifteen o'clock ...

---

## TUESDAY GROUP LUNCHEON

April 3, 1962

Group Luncheon B, "Counseling Provisions for the Future," convened at one-twenty-five o'clock, Robert W. Pitcher, Dean of Students, Baldwin-Wallace College, presiding.

CHAIRMAN PITCHER: I think we will get the ball rolling here. We are happy to welcome you to this luncheon and to a discussion of "Counseling Provisions for the Future." The session itself will be conducted very informally. We have several resource people here of varying degrees of skill and knowledge. Bill Martinson over here is Director of Counseling at Indiana University. We have Bill Lacy who is Dean of Students at Trinity College, located at Hartford. Then we have the Dean of Students from Hawaii, Harold Bitner.

In the whole process we have under discussion this afternoon, we are going to have a few statements regarding trends, or pressures, or forces which are present in the college scene, and then we will move into a discussion which we trust you will take a very active part in. Prior to getting into this, I have been asked to make an announcement. Tomorrow morning, Wednesday, at eight a.m., there will be an informal breakfast meeting of all persons from Pennsylvania institutions attending the Conference. The meeting will take place in the coffee shop, tomorrow morning at eight a.m. Those planning to attend the meeting are requested to sign up before four today at the Registration Desk.

I think that it would be quite inappropriate, probably, to attempt to give a speech on these questions of the forces which are operating on a college campus. I am reminded of the comment that a woman listener made to one of the representatives from Pennsylvania after he had concluded an address. She came up and said to him, "That speech was simply superfluous; very superfluous." (Laughter) He was taken a-back for a moment or two, and then he thought he would test her on a few other words, and he said, "I was thinking of having it published posthumously." (Laughter) She said, "Oh, that will be just fine, and the sooner the better." (Laughter)

Lest we get into too many superfluous words, I want to try to point out that when we get into the topic of counseling provisions for the future, we have definite limitations on our own information and our own ability to predict what is going to happen out here ahead of us. I think it is also very true that the kinds of things that develop are

going to be related to the specific campus situation, so it is very hard to generalize.

Kurt Levin, one of the psychologists who has done quite a bit of writing, prior to his death, tended to view all human situations as dynamic. He believed that the end result of a given situation was actually the resolution of the forces present in the situation. That is, after a process of mutual accommodations, the situation reached a kind of state of equilibrium.

Now, for our purposes there is this suggestion, that the counseling provisions of the future will tend to be the result of the resolutions of forces operating now and at that time in our respective campus situations; driving forces which tend to increase counseling provisions, provisions for counseling; and restraining forces which tend to hold these in check or diminish counseling resources.

Let us look at a few of these driving forces, the forces which tend toward expansion. They are very obvious. I think you are acquainted with them in varying degrees, depending upon how they operate on your campus.

I think one of the positive forces toward, let's say, enlargement or expansion is the overwhelming belief of many student personnel people that counseling is essential. This conviction that counseling must be a part of an adequate program operates as a force. It colors the things we say, the kinds of reports we make, the sort of things we do when we are in groups. There is no doubt on the part of many of the student personnel people that counseling is good.

It is difficult, I suspect, to divorce this feeling from the feeling that is developing in our culture of concern over mental health, and concern over the psychological factors that precipitate or help to determine behavior. I came across an illustration of preoccupation with, let's say, psychological or psychiatric terminology, in a column written by John Crosby some years ago. He was writing about a horse that had been named Psychotherapy that was running in a race at Hialeah Racetrack. He wrote something like this. "Psychiatric terminology has invaded every field. Let's keep it out of horse racing. Well, what was the actual parentage of Psychotherapy? Out of Mother Hatred by Father Image, I suppose. Probably he will sire a host of colts named Neurotic, Sibling Rivalry, Oedipus Complex. The next thing you know they will be naming Pullman cars Hysterical Blindness, and so on. This thing has to stop."

Actually, this preoccupation or interest in mental health is bound to effect the sort of developments that occur on a college campus.

Secondly, I think the expectation and demand by parents that counseling be done is a very potent force. This is

gaining momentum, and I believe it will continue to gain momentum in the years which are ahead. As a college education becomes increasingly necessary, parents will demand more counseling help so that their sons and daughters will be able to complete their programs. Do not underestimate the pressure.

While I do not have any exact figures, at the end of the fall quarter of this year, state colleges in Ohio dismissed for academic reasons over 2,500 students. This poses a very real problem to the families; and to the parents, counseling, proper counseling, is one of the main solutions.

The third force, of course, is the great increase in enrollment. We have all studied these figures. There is no need for me to attempt to describe them, except to go into enough detail to point out that as enrollment increases, as the number of students perhaps even doubles within the next ten years on many of our campuses, that the sheer numbers themselves will cause a great strain upon the counseling resources.

Fourth is the dependency, or the dependence upon counseling of the students coming from high schools which have counseling programs. Students today are expecting counseling much more than they used to. Secondary schools have been taking giant steps in this area; and consequently, students just come to expect that they are going to receive help on certain kinds of decisions.

Fifth, I think there has been a shift in student interest and concern to academic excellence. Most, if not all, campuses have felt the impact of greater seriousness on the part of students in achievement in the academic area. They are concerned about the proper techniques of study. They have problems concerning vocational choice. They get concerned more rapidly about interference in their study from roommates, and poor inter-personal relationships. The selection of courses are things which they are more interested in today.

And as these students' concerns develop, they will impell them to seek more counseling help.

This, of course, is a brief summary of these forces which tend to expand the driving forces. Let us look at a few, very briefly, on the opposite side. First, there is an increased emphasis on faculty salaries. In most of our institutions this is very true. Seldom are administrative salaries mentioned in the same way. There is in our institution, as in many institutions, a limit to the amount of money which is available. As faculty salaries take an increased percentage of the institutional budget there is bound to be an increased concern on the part of the chief administrator to hold in check, or to hold down expansion in service areas.

Secondly, a restraining force is that often there is a lack of understanding on the part of the faculty and the



administration of the value of counseling. We may be convinced of it, but far too often they view this from the negative aspect of relieving them of wearisome chores and time consuming problems. The positive features of effective counseling have not had wide and strong support. I think there is a very real problem of establishing proof that counseling is effective.

The problem of getting a statistical base, or having other evidence of success faces us. We may spend so many hours on a difficult case, and yet it is hard to account for that time in a meaningful way.

As the competition for institutional funds increases the demand for acceptable evidence will intensify. In light of the difficulty of obtaining this evidence, it is conceivable that the case for the enlargement of counseling provisions will be weakened.

Another restraining influence, it seems to me, is that many chief administrators in colleges and universities are buffeted by many pressures so that they tend to respond to crises rather than just to logic, or even to need. The threat of an impending crisis is so much more real to them than the possible benefits from an expanded budget for counseling that frequently their decisions are against expansion, and tend to be restraining or toward maintaining the status quo.

These are some of the chief operating forces -- not all of them. But it seems to me that as these forces operate on each other, and upon us, that we begin to get some of the answers as to what the counseling provisions for the future will be.

Now, we would like to open this for discussion. I do not know that any of us have the answers. We are very interested in exploring today some of the ways and means which will give us, I think, a sense of direction for the future. We have resource people here at the table. They are very happy to answer questions directed to them. I understand this is part of their role, and if no one directs a question to them I am sure that they will participate anyway because they have been thinking about this and are primed for it.

Can we start off with either some comment about a development you know of, or a trend, perhaps a force, or a condition which has not been mentioned that you think is of prime importance, or a development that has taken place on your campus that you think the rest would be interested in?

DEAN JOHN HOCUTT: I might begin with a question. First of all, I should say that I believe in counseling. I support the counseling program. But I am wondering whether, as enrollments increase, the demand for admissions increases,

whether some institutions may take the attitude that why spend all this money that we are spending on individuals who need special remedial services? They will look upon counseling as a remedial service. Do you think that this is a possibility?

CHAIRMAN PITCHER: Do you have a reaction to that?

DEAN HAROLD M. BITNER (University of Hawaii): Well, my reaction to that would be that if the schools -- that is the schools that can select the students that they want from this vast number of applicants -- if they select the student then I feel they have some responsibility to try to assist him in making his way through to graduation.

In other words, if he was a good risk, and looked like a good bet to begin with, then I think they have some responsibility to see to it that he goes through until graduation. I do not think that most of the work that would be done on a student like that would be remedial. That would be my reaction. It would probably be lack of ability to adjust for maybe short periods of time; temporary difficulties of that sort. That would be my reaction.

DEAN MARK SMITH: May I carry that just a little further? I believe that counseling is the next best thing to therapy. Isn't it true that the counseling that a professional counselor would see for the future may be viewed by people with very rigid faculty points of view as doing nothing but re-enforcing behavior which has become a substitute for academic achievement? How soon is it going to be when budget considerations really start biting, when numbers start biting us? Somebody looking for a better answer than numbers or budgets is going to say, "I honestly think counseling interferes with the teaching function; that these counselors are going around really telling students, 'If you can't achieve a status as a good student you can have plenty of counseling and that will give you status and attention and love and affection'." It becomes almost a fraternity that the student enters when he gets into college, seeking all the wonderful, warm counseling available to him. (Laughter)

DEAN MARTIN: What makes that the role of professional counseling? I don't see that at all.

DEAN MARK SMITH: Your role is as you are perceived by those who are taking advantage of your service, isn't it?

DEAN MARTIN: It is possible. If that is the kind of image that is being created, then I think the professional counselors have a devil of a job to do, if that is the way he is being perceived by both his colleagues, and his deans, and his faculty members, because certainly this is not the way he perceives himself, as great mother earth with all the little students in his wide arms. If he is working in an institutional setting, his primary purpose for being there, as I would see

it, is to allow and to assist the individuals to become better students in their situation, not simply to give them a lot of tender, loving care if they are not doing their job as students.

And if that is not his role in an institutional set-up, then either he is being mis-perceived, or the institution is not getting a fair shake for their investment, because this is not some little clinic type operation that is sitting there independently to pick up the pieces as they are shattered in the classroom and the residence halls. It is designed to help the individual integrate his forces to make this total experience as valuable and productive to him as possible.

DEAN O. WILSON LACY (Trinity College): I know a good many faculty people who really do not care much about what happens to him in the residence hall, and on the football team. They conceive of their primary role, indeed their bread-winning role, as the imparting of knowledge, and seeking other knowledge. And when the dean comes up to the faculty man, or the faculty man comes to the dean and says, "Well, this guy has to go; he's not doing anything in my class; he's not worth a darn." What the counselor does, or what the dean is likely to do is to say, "You failed. You don't see this as a whole person." And it is awfully hard to get acceptance from people whom you are accusing of failure. They perceive their role somewhat differently.

So the counselor, it seems to me, has to take some other tack. I am not really sure what that tack out to be always. I want to make a disclaimer here, that like most deans I reserve the right to be inconsistent. I am reminded of my friend Bill Carrol, down in that little college down on the Coast, down at Yale, who says that the primary characteristic of a dean is a person of a certain low cunning and patience. (Laughter) It seems to me that this is what the counselor, whether he is going to be a dean or a psychologist working in a counseling service, has to be. He has to exercise a certain amount of low cunning. If he really believes that whether he falls to pieces on the tennis court, God forbid, or where, if he believes that this person ought to be put back together as a whole person, in terms of mathematics, or physics, he has to be patient, not only with the student who is falling apart, but the faculty person who is not falling apart about him.

DEAN I. CLARK DAVIS (Southern Illinois University): Isn't there another related trend here that bears on the facts? It seems to me that more and more faculty members as they come in now have a broader background in psychology and sociology and other related courses. This is true in home economics, agriculture, and so on, where they have had sociologists go into social work, social psychology, and so on. And the real trend, it seems to me, in this decade ahead, is that more and more colleges and schools, or departments, are indeed

going into the counseling business, and that maybe the role of a counseling center, a centralized unit, in the future, will be not seeing students but relating and helping the academic units carry out these functions and give them in-service training, if that is indicated, and some guidance and leadership, if necessary, when they ask for it. I sense this more than just in one institution. I think it is very widespread, and I do not think in that case we have to worry about the limitations on budget. I think we can actually do the job with about the same numbers that we have now of professional people. I think that this is in the picture, at least in the role of the large institutions.

DEAN WILLIAM D. MARTINSON (Indiana University): In relation to Mark's comment about counseling, and the interruption of the learning process, I sense, in Indiana, that there is a close identification between the counseling office and the faculty in terms of contributing to the general education of the student; that this is one and the same kind of thing, done on a different basis. In other words, rather than formal classroom, on the one to one basis. I support this just a little bit by saying this: In terms of statistics, about one-third of the students who are seen at our counseling service are referrals from the faculty. They are referred with statements to this effect: "Would you help us with John Doakes" -- or whatever his name is -- "in helping this student to see a little more clearly some of the objectives, or some of the aims, or in understanding himself so he can profit from this kind of experience?"

In regard to the remark on counseling and budget, one of the things that I think is going to be necessary is that counselors be permitted to counsel. Perhaps I am being critical of deans, but I think somewhere along the line there ought to be a definition of function in terms of what is a counseling office. I would say that one-third to one-half, perhaps even more than this, in terms of time is spent in non-counseling activities. Somewhere there should be a freeing of counselors to do those things for which they are being paid. Perhaps this faculty counseling within a department, a division, is a step in the right direction, allowing the counselors then to do those things for which counselors are hired.

DEAN FRANK C. BALDWIN (Cornell University): On that basis that you don't have enough time, and we all admit that, and also that you will have a limitation of budget, as John Hocutt has said, and also that you can use the faculty more, if they are willing to take the responsibility, which I know a number are not and will have nothing to do with it -- they say they are interested in teaching a subject -- assuming all those things then, it appears to me that one of the ways out is to get some students, mature students, juniors and seniors, who have had some experience and who are somewhat the same ages as these other boys and girls, whichever the case may be, and they could be used to a great deal more advantage, I think, than they have been in many institutions, and that they are

being used more in ours, as I can testify by a couple who are here now. I was wondering if this is not one of the bases that we might work on, to find out how to train some of these people.

My feeling is that they can do more good than they can do damage, if they are properly talked to and trained up to a certain extent. And many of them we have found, in using them as counselors, have found that they want to go on and continue with this once they get a little taste of it, the teaching angle and the counseling. So my feeling is that they are going to help to save the day for many of us who are trying to do a counseling job, and not from any namby-pamby business, because they can talk straight from the shoulder to these fellows, and they respect them. My feeling is that this is one of the avenues that I think we would do well to go down to do some more training of matured students whom we can trust, who have been successful themselves, and who may have had some troubles in their first couple of years and are, therefore, in a position of having just passed through this stage and are able to make some strong contribution. But we have to make use of them.

DEAN LACY: I would like to comment on that a little bit. I think this is quite true, and I agree with you, Ted. In the long run, you are going to run into less real trouble using student counselors than you are using faculty counselors. There is less danger there, and I think it is pretty well established that despite our pretensions most of the learning that takes place in institutions does not take place in the classroom. It does not take place in the dean's office. It is pretty traumatic at best, but it takes place in the interchange of ideas between students.

I think the problem of the selection of these students is an exceedingly difficult one. If you can select upper-classmen, we know they are not trained to do psychotherapy, and most of them don't try to do it. But this can take off a great deal of the load.

DEAN BITNER: I would like to suggest another possibility of help and assistance in this area, and that is in the area outside the campus, off the campus. This would, of course, vary depending on the location of the school and the location conditions; but if you are in a large city, or in our case, in the state capital, there are a number of facilities and resources that are available from other agencies, state or public agencies.

I would like to give two examples. One is placement. For years we did not enjoy the services of a placement office, and we found out that the State Employment Office was only too happy to have listings of college graduates. At one time we felt that no one turned to them for that type of person; and they served a real purpose and they have done a fine job for us.

Another one: For years and years we tried to get a psychiatrist on our staff, as a part of the counseling center, and this had been rejected right straight through and right along. I turned to the State Director of Health, and he got one assigned to us through his office.

So there are possibilities, I think, that we are not looking into in some of our communities.

DEAN DONALD A. KLUGE (Eastern Illinois University): We have a similar situation with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation for our clinical psychologists. Also, we use our residence hall counselors in our counseling center on a part-time basis.

DEAN WILLIAM F. FIELD (University of Massachusetts): I hate to be a lone dissenter here, but in relation to faculty as counselors, I did a little run-down on it the other day, because I was sort of appalled at how few of the younger faculty members I thought were really involved in student counseling. I grant that the departments had assigned faculty, or deans had assigned faculty within the schools to do counseling, but I was concerned about how our new faculty members were moving in.

I compared the group of young Ph.D.'s we have hired in the last, let's say, the last 100 we have hired in the last two years, with the group that came back in 1951-52. I found in going over them, name by name, there was a much lower degree of willingness to be counselors. They really saw their mission as professors, as publishers, as scholars, in a much more limited sense, and I am worried about the problems we are going to have with selling an in-service training with these newer Ph.D.'s. They do not seem to be like the group we were getting in 1951-52. This may be an isolated case.

DEAN DONALD P. HARDY (University of Delaware): I would be interested to find out if this was at the same point in their professional careers?

DEAN FIELD: Yes. A number of men, about ten years ago, after they made tenure, became involved in counseling. I knew them and compared those men with the last 100 Ph.D.'s we picked up who are now on tenure. This is the group that came in in 1959. They have not become involved. They like the counseling office and they refer students readily. They are happy about us, but they are not as willing to become as involved with the broader student involvement.

DEAN MARK SMITH: Perhaps they are just getting better scholars. That may be the conclusion.

DEAN LACY: That is quite true. This is off the subject, I think, because this gets over into the problem of how you reward your faculty; and if anyone can come up with a way that will really satisfy the faculty person for his counseling

efforts then I think you will get them to go into it, and you will find some -- not all -- who will be good counselors. But most members of the faculty recognize that the way up the academic ladder is to publish, and to get notice in their own academic disciplines, and nobody likes to serve on committees. It is a most unrewarding task. And nobody likes to spend an awful lot of time "with children," as they say, if they can be in their laboratory.

This is the reason you are getting fewer and fewer. I think that trend is going to continue and grow worse.

DEAN FIELD: I am afraid it is, and I do not see any way, frankly, that we can reverse the calculated honesty with which these younger Ph.D.'s see their advancement.

DEAN LACY: I can tell you how. Get a means of rewarding them. Pay them, and get your president or your academic dean who evaluates their performance to put proper weight on this function of their total academic responsibility.

I haven't been able to do this in my place, but maybe somebody else has. (Laughter)

DEAN FIELD: We can release them from teaching time; you can pay them an additional stipend; and we have looked at both of these things and we have not had the courage to try either one of them, mostly because good faculty are in very short supply and the thought of releasing his time is not as economically sound to a dean as hiring another counselor.

DEAN LACY: Yes, you can buy a good counselor a lot cheaper than you can buy a physicist.

DEAN FIELD: That is very true.

DEAN KLUGE: Do we distinguish here between academic advisement and counseling? I am confused. People are talking about the academic area of advisement.

DEAN FIELD: I am talking about the counseling area that a lot of our academic faculty had with our students years ago. Of course, they all seem to feel that they can do counseling as a matter of reflex action. (Laughter) They make pronouncements, but I don't think they are counseling students and discussing the student's development in the university, and himself in the university setting, as they used to.

DEAN KLUGE: But in talking about in-service training, we are talking about what kind of counseling?

DEAN FIELD: Ten years ago we did in-service training with faculty for counseling on simple personal problems, adjustment to the university, going outside of academic advisement. We haven't done it for the past five or six years. I

think it is going to be a difficult thing to get moving ever again.

ASST. DIRECTOR RONALD E. BARNES (Iowa State): I hope we are being realistic in this discussion here because we talk about students doing more counseling and faculty perhaps doing more counseling; yet by the nature of the university I am not entirely sure this is going to be. Certainly with students I am not at all sure it should be, with the dedication which they must have to the university.

I wonder too if anyone would care to respond to the problem, which certainly we feel, of those who you hire to do counseling feeling the pressure to do research, in-service training, teaching, thus having less time for counseling. I feel it is getting very difficult to hire a counselor these days.

DEAN MARTINSON: On this particular point, taking off again on deans, I think it is necessary somewhere along the line for the dean of students to talk with the counselors, to talk about what are the services of the university. I personally do not believe that a college campus is a therapeutic environment. I am not talking about psychotherapy now. I am talking about adjustment problems. What kinds of things does the dean want in his counseling program? What definition, in other words, of function? Then, within this definition of function, you have a certain allotted period of time. There is so much that you can do.

My pet peeve is this matter of not being able to do the counseling. The dean will say, "Now, why don't you--" or "It would be a good idea if you--" and then go on with something that perhaps is borderline, something touching upon counseling but really not the counseling function, something that might be carried out by a clerk, a good secretary, or perhaps by a graduate student. This ties in again with this matter of faculty counseling as opposed to advising.

One of the things that I think deans are going to have to do somewhere is to do something in terms of group processes -- not group counseling or multiple counseling, but group processes in the sharing of information. Whether this is through an orientation program, whether this is through an approach to group testing, or test interpretation, something in terms of university services and what might be available, these are techniques that I think the dean could use in communicating with faculty and students. In our counseling office, or on our campus, one of the big problems is not in providing the service, but in making the service known. We find that many of the problems that arise in counseling are the result of lack of information about the facilities. It seems like a paradox, but I think the more that the services are known to the students the less need for the counseling service. I think these other agencies then pick up part of the load and there is a sharing of this responsibility.



DEAN WILLIAM H. KNAPP (Wayne State University): I would like to go back to your introduction of the question. Is there any assumption in Ohio that the 2,600 drop-outs in the last quarter would have been saved by a greater number of college counselors on the campus?

CHAIRMAN PITCHER: I would have to give a personal reaction. I think that from the parental standpoint there is this assumption, not necessarily from the institution's standpoint.

DEAN KNAPP: Perhaps the answer might be a greater amount of counseling at the high school level.

CHAIRMAN PITCHER: Right.

Have there been any particular developments which have taken place relatively recently that you would like to share with the group? We have time limitations here because there was no break following the other meeting, to any extent, and I think we should have a break before we get into our two-thirty meeting. So may we take just a few statements of developments that have occurred.

DEAN ALEXANDER: I would like to ask another question if I may. I was getting ready when you made your statement about what your assumptions were of the nature of counseling. I wanted each one up here to declare himself, because I was not sure we all were talking about the same thing. It was suggested that one function might be to see that the faculty are doing more effectively some things that they are now doing that might be done by counseling services. Certainly, in the other direction, counseling services, I think, on any campus where there is a university psychiatrist should be working with him, and working that way. What is the particular role, as distinguished from the role of the faculty adviser, and the medical office; what is the particular role that the various ones there find for the counseling service?

DEAN BITNER: Well, my reaction would be similar to the one that was just given. We define the role as the individual across a desk being counselor. He carries out this responsibility. This is not academic advising. It is not a student activities program. It is not collecting data for somebody else's report, or that sort of thing.

DEAN ALEXANDER: To what extent is it psychotherapy as you view it?

DEAN BITNER: I think that certain individuals would carry out psychotherapy. I wanted to get back to Mark's point. I think Mark was making the point that sometimes the best psychotherapy is no psychotherapy. But I think you have to have some people on your staff who are capable of doing that. Then I think there are other types of counselors you might have in the same office who might be working with a

vocational type of problem, let us say, financial -- or I would put the financial aids counselor in a separate office, probably, but that sort of thing.

But as a dean, I would agree that there is a great deal of waste of the resources that we have at the present time. You send people to some type of specialist, and eventually he may end up receiving psychotherapy.

DEAN LACY: I think what you are saying I would put this way. Use the image of the traffic cop. I think a good dean of students may be qualified to do a certain amount of counseling, but by the very nature of his role he is going to be rendered somewhat ineffective in it, by and large. It is hard to carry the big stick and at the same time say "Follow, I want to help you," if you are beating him over the head with the big stick. It seems to me that very frequently the dean of students is acting like a traffic cop. He is saying, "Now you go to placement; you go to financial aids; and you are pretty bad, you need to be so thoroughly reinforced," Mark, "that you ought to go to a real head shrinker instead of just a modified head shrinker." (Laughter) And so on. That is part of it.

But the actual counseling, I don't think you can draw a distinction between what is psychotherapy for a guy who is psychotic, and what is psychotherapy for a guy who has so little money and the tuition is so great that he is frankly going mad. He wants to stay here.

DEAN MARK SMITH: I think we are overlooking some real danger signs. In the first place, there is no substantial or substantive evidence that the development of counseling programs and divisions have helped students. We know that they have helped the colleges and they have made us look good, but we have no evidence at all that this has benefitted the student.

DEAN LACY: You have no evidence that psychotherapy does any good.

DEAN MARK SMITH: Certainly not, and that is why we don't practice it as often. (Laughter) There are danger signs. There are danger signs in the sense that we have an increasing number of applications for admission on the basis of recommendations from the guidance counselors mentioning our guidance counselors as reasons why students should come to us. "This is a mediocre student, but he will be able to benefit from the fine counseling services that your college has." Counselors, like health services, are unable not to counsel. What would we do if 50 men were in the hospital, not sick, but he thought he ought to allow them to stay in the hospital in order to get out of classes? We have an increasing number of faculty members who are naive about counseling to the extent that they call us at final exam time about a student who is getting a D and should be getting a B, and saying, "Could you

give me some reason concerning an emotional disturbance or something?" They really want to give him a better grade on our say so if he can qualify under the emotional difficulty category. They want to reward him for being sick. So I think it is our responsibility to watch these danger signs. And as numbers grow, as money becomes more valuable, let's provide service that is needed by the student, not by the professional person. Let's quit creating jobs for people and create services for students. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN PITCHER: I think this is probably a very good note for us to conclude on. It is about five after two, and we need a good break before the afternoon meeting.

Thank you, gentlemen.

... The group recessed at two-five o'clock ...

---

## TUESDAY AFTERNOON SEMINAR VII

April 3, 1962

Seminar VII convened at two-forty o'clock, Chairman John P. Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College, NASPA Vice President Designate, presiding.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: If we may, I think we might better start, and those of you who feel free to do so might come up and sit in front, if you have any inclination to do so.

I am sure all of us in the educational world are well aware of the fact that testing has become a real giant these days in our colleges. Of course, we see them used for admissions, placement, advanced placement, graduate schools, using them for admission to law, medicine, business administration. At Beloit I have recently had several companies carrying on interviews on the campus, requesting college board scores for their interviewing purposes. We see them used in classification on getting into the army, and, consequently, I think with the number of tests that are being given, and the fear on the part of many college administrators that this is becoming a regular bugaboo, perhaps, when one thinks of the 600 to 600,000 tests being given for the National Merit Scholarship Tests alone, I think this meeting today has real significance for us.

Our speaker, Mr. Robert Ebel, did his undergraduate work at Iowa State Teachers College, where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree, and then went on to the Iowa State University --

MR. EBEL: State University of Iowa.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: -- State University of Iowa for his Masters and Doctor of Philosophy. He has taught in secondary schools in the area of science and math, had some experience in secondary school administration, and is now Professor of Education and Director of the university examination service at the University.

Mr. Ebel has told me he is not here today to either defend tests or promote them, but, rather to perhaps be of some assistance to us in indicating how the testing program and the use of tests can be of real help to us in our educational needs.

Mr. Ebel is going to speak, and then we will allow for questions and answers afterwards, and I might ask now, if those of you who have questions, if when you ask them you will please give your name and school.

Mr. Ebel, we are happy to have you here with us.

MR. ROBERT L. EBEL (Vice President for General Programs, Educational Testing Service): Thank you, Dean Gwin, and Ladies and Gentlemen. I will have to add one item to that. I am current Vice President for General Programs of the Education Testing Service in Princeton.

I cannot claim to be an unbiased observer of the testing scene. I hope that I can claim to be at least a partially informed observer.

In one of his journal entries, Ralph Waldo Emerson records, "William Little came to hear my sermon against mind-ing trifles. He told me at the close that had he been speak-ing he would have taken the other side. Perhaps no one else in the audience thought so far about the matter." Now, I interpret that to mean that Emerson was pleased to have some-one think critically enough about what he had to say to be inclined to disagree with him. I am not inviting disagree-ment here, just for the sake of disagreement. I suspect that some of it may come spontaneously. Having worked in an office that was only two or three doors removed from the office of the Dean of Students at the University of Iowa for some ten years, I think in that situation we got to know each other quite well, and I am afraid that the workings of my office caused more trouble to the Dean of Students than the workings of his office did to mine.

Recently, in the public prints, there has been notice of a member of a prominent family running for public office, who was dismissed from his university for having persuaded another student to take an examination for him. This is one of the occasions where the examinations office and the dean of students office sometimes have dealing with each other, the matter of honesty and ethics in examinations. But there are so many interesting and important things for us to consider about the relations of examinations and testing to higher edu-cation that I do not want to waste too much time in preliminar-ies.

This presentation of mine, like a good sermon, is divided into three parts, and it is divided, very logically, into the past, the present, and the future, insofar as I can see the future.

What have been the principle developments in the last ten years as they affect testing and the use of tests?

Well, one thing which Dean Gwin has already touched on is the almost phenomenal increase in the use of tests. Ten years ago, roughly, 1950-51, there were some 70,000 students who took the College Board scholastic aptitude test. In the last full year, for which we have records, 1960-61, there were 850,000 -- more than a ten-fold increase in a period of ten years.

Ten years ago there was no scholarship qualifying

test, or what it has now become, a preliminary scholastic aptitude test, intended primarily for guidance purposes and given primarily to high school juniors.

Last year 730,000 students took the preliminary scholastic aptitude test. Ten years ago roughly 1,000 students took long, arduous examinations in the hope of getting advanced placement in college. Last year that number was 18,000.

Our graduate record examination at a higher level was taken by 45,000 students ten years ago. Last year somewhat over 130,000 students took the examination. The National Teacher Examination ten years ago enrolled 15,000 students. Last year, 31,000 students. A law school admission test that was started about ten years ago tested 7,000 students. Last year, 23,000 students.

In all of these cases there has been this consistent picture of increasing use of written examinations in wide-scale, externally controlled testing programs.

One might ask why this is. Has there been any technical breakthrough in testing? I think the answer to that would have to be no. We have made improvements in tests, but I think it is more associated with an increase in the practice of selective admissions in colleges. Unfortunately, I do not have figures covering the same span of time for selective admissions, but even in the last two years, going from 1960 to 1962, the increase in policies of selective admissions by college and graduate schools have increased markedly.

In 1960 approximately 16-1/2% of our institutions of higher education reported that they were competitive or highly competitive. That is, that entrance admission was on a competitive or highly competitive basis. In 1962, this current year, the report is 21%.

Incidentally, I should say these figures are taken from Hawes' book on the "New American Guide to Colleges," and while I have said '60 and '62, these are the dates when his figures were published, and I think they reflect what had happened just previously. Currently, only about a third of our institutions of higher education are willing to accept almost anyone who applies, provided he is a high school graduate.

Now, this pattern of selective admissions is geographically oriented. In the New England States, and down in the Middle Atlantic as far down as New Jersey, the proportion is currently a little over 50% of the institutions that are competitive or highly competitive. Two years ago it was only 40%. As you go down the East Coast, from Delaware on south, the proportion is somewhat smaller, but in the last two years it has jumped from 17% to 27%. In the Midwest the proportion

is still smaller, but there is an unmistakable trend toward increasing selectivity in admission to higher education.

Another element in this increasing use of tests has been the growth of scholarship programs, and whether this growth of scholarship programs has been the result of or a cause of increased emphasis on excellence in education, it is a little hard to say. The two things have gone pretty much hand in hand.

In my days as a high school science teacher, I knew about and occasionally tried to prepare students for the Westinghouse Science Talent Search. I am sure there have been other competitive scholarship programs, but that is the first one I knew anything about. Since that time there is the famous, widespread National Merit Scholarship Program, financed with Ford money. General Motors, not to be outdone by Ford, has its scholarship program.

Incidentally, I would report to you that whatever their faults and drawbacks may be, these scholarship programs do manage to select, to encourage, to help an exceedingly fine group of young people. Two years ago the first class of General Motors scholarship winners graduated, so to speak, from the program, and at the meeting that was held in Princeton, New Jersey, by the committees engaged in reviewing applications and awarding scholarships for the next year, the program at the banquet was provided by a half dozen of these scholarship winners. I must report to you, and this may be the occasion of some of our fear of tests, that what those young people said and did on that occasion, the evidence of culture that they presented, of idealism, was amazing to me. It was an exhilarating experience to hear college seniors talking with the poise, the assurance, background and objectives for progress that these young people exhibited on that occasion.

We have, at the graduate level, to encourage people to enter college teaching, the Woodrow Wilson Scholarship Program. Tests are not a formal part of that program, but students are encouraged to report, in the graduate record, record examination tests if they have taken them.

The Educational Testing Service is currently engaged in a small project, in cooperation with the American Association of Physics Teachers, to develop a test of competence for teachers in high school physics, whose purpose is not any financial award, but simply the designation of a certificate of competence, of special competence in this one aspect of the preparation or qualification for success in physics teaching.

I have not mentioned at all the numerous state scholarship programs. All of you know, I think, that educational fashions tend to swing with the pendulum. Shortly after I became a high school teacher, the pendulum was swinging far in the direction of life adjustment. The happiness, the welfare

of the pupil were of paramount consideration, and somewhat in second place was the emphasis on scholarship and achievement. I think the pendulum has swung to the opposite direction, not to the point where people are forgetting about problems of emotional adjustment, but where there is considerably more tendency to place the primary emphasis on academic achievement.

Another thing that has happened in the last ten years is the growth of testing services. The organization I represent was established in 1948 -- a little more than ten years ago. It represented a pooling of the activities of a number of foundations, or educational agencies. The College Entrance Examination Board, the American Council on Education, the Carnegie Corporation, were the primary groups that pooled their testing activities to form the Educational Testing Service. Those who were instrumental in establishing this agency, and they were leading college presidents around the country, including Connant and others, felt that there would be greater efficiency, more cross-fertilization of ideas, if all of these testing activities could be gotten into one agency.

The Educational Testing Service has developed not as phenomenally as testing has developed. We have perhaps twice as many employees now as we had when we were established, but along with the development of the Educational Testing Service has developed competition from other agencies. Science Research Associates, for example, was not initially established as a testing agency, and still is not, certainly, exclusively a testing agency, but in the mid-1950's it got into the business of running supervised security testing programs, primarily for the government, and it has expanded into other areas.

The Psychological Corporation, New York City, originally a test publisher, and psychologically oriented, has gotten into the field of testing in the medical sciences, selection testing for the medical sciences. More recently, the American College Testing Program has been developed to meet special needs for the less selective colleges or ones which were more interested in placement testing, particularly in the Midwest and in the Mountain states, although it reaches out beyond that.

So, whatever charge can be laid to the Educational Testing Service, and I am sure some can be laid with justice, being a monopoly in testing is not one of them. We are faced with competition, stimulating competition -- sometimes we use other terms to describe it -- that in a sense, at least, among its other effects, tends to keep us on our toes.

Another important development in the last ten years has been the development of high-speed test scoring and data processing equipment. Many of you are familiar with the IBM 805 scoring machine, which, in its day -- and I think it was developed during World War II, or along about that period -- represented a marvelous advance over hand scoring, counting



marks on answer sheets clerically. A good operator could get 200 to 400 scores an hour on a machine of that type, sometimes more.

E. F. Lindquist, at the State University of Iowa, developed a high-speed electronic scoring machine using photo-electric principles. That machine will score 4,000 sheets of paper an hour and get up to 12 scores on each sheet that it scores, which is quite an improvement over the IBM 805.

The Educational Testing Service has recently developed a similar type of machine that works on somewhat different principles, which has about the same kind of a capacity.

Coupled with these things have been the modern electronic computers that enable us to process data with exceeding speed, but an interesting thing is that when College Board tests were being scored by hand or by the old IBM 805 machine we required 28 days from the time the test was given until the scores were reported to the colleges. With our high-speed test scoring machine and data processing equipment the time required is still 28 days. There has not been any shortening of that period of time. Part of this is because when you get new equipment you find new things for it do do, and people are not satisfied with the old simple reports. Now they want more complex reports that take greater time to produce. Another part of the problem is that simply gathering the tests in, scoring them centrally, getting them collated and spreading them out becomes an immensely more difficult task when you are scoring 850,000 a year than it was when you were scoring only 70,000 a year. I think the difficulty of handling a testing program may increase somewhat in a geometric progression in relation to the size of the program.

Now, all of this has been more or less on the business aspect of testing. What about the quality of the tests themselves?

In the last ten-year period we have seen a rise in prestige of the interpretive type of test. Objective tests were well established, widely used when the period began, and I think there has been no slackening or no diminution of the popularity of objective tests; neither has there been any diminution of the criticism directed toward objective tests by those who prefer the essay type of examination. But within the field of objective testing itself the tendency has been, instead of writing discreet questions, single questions, each touching on a separate principle or ability or item of information, to provide background material and to ask students questions designed to elicit their ability to interpret the material which has been presented to them.

Some of you know that while the ACE psychological examination is still available, it has been in a sense superseded by the School and College Ability Test. The one that is called SCAT. The old cooperative tests of subject matter

competence have been to a degree superseded by the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress, which we call STEP.

The interesting thing is that SCAT and STEP, the modern versions of aptitude and achievement tests, are much more like each other than the old ACE psychological test and aptitude test and the old cooperative achievement tests were. There has been a tendency to make intelligence tests more oriented to background knowledge and ability to use knowledge, and there has been a tendency to make the achievement tests more oriented to that principle to the point where some people raise a serious question as to whether or not we need these two kinds of tests at all.

Is it necessary to have separate aptitude and achievement tests?

Indeed, I think you would find among specialists in educational testing a pretty good consensus that there is no clear distinction as far as the form of the test is concerned, between an aptitude test and an achievement test, that you simply cannot measure these things separately.

In our own shop at the Educational Testing Service, a few years ago, we worked hard to develop some tests of developed ability, as they were called. These were intended for use in the College Board program, and it was interesting to me that they were based on the concept that ability can somehow be divorced from knowledge. In the science area, for example, the test was supposed to distinguish clearly between students who had had four years of science and those who had had only two years of science, without requiring them to know any science that is not taught in ninth grade general science.

Now, I may not be presenting this fairly, because I happen to disbelieve in this notion. It seems to me that what you acquire as you study additional sciences is not a mysterious ability to deal with science information, it is knowledge of what composition of forces means, and what Brownian movement is, and what valence means; that control of important concepts and principles represents the essential outcome of the study of sciences, and I think I would say this is the essential outcome in other areas as well. But the view that there is an ability separate from the subject matter on which that ability is used was the dominating notion in the tests of developed ability.

It turned out that they did not add anything to what was already being obtained by the College Board aptitude and achievement tests, so they were dropped.

Finally, in this ten-year period, there has been growing criticism of tests. There has been criticism of intelligence tests, and I would say that on the whole this criticism has been pretty well justified. Somehow psychologists and

professors of education have sold most people, teachers and parents alike, a highly over-simplified notion of what intelligence is. Some of you may have noticed an article that appeared in the National Parent-Teacher, I think, first, although there are reports that it was originally commissioned by the Reader's Digest -- at any rate, it was reprinted in the Reader's Digest. This was under the title, "Let's Look Again at Those IQ Tests." Mr. Leggman, who wrote the article, I think performed a useful service in calling into question some widely held but unsubstantiatable notions about intelligence and IQ tests. Unfortunately, he included in it some misconceptions of his own, and he quoted a number of eminent people in support of some of these misconceptions.

I engaged in a little exercise of trying to see if I couldn't set the record straight here. So far it has not produced much fruit except a very cordial letter from Mr. Leggman saying that he was reporting the facts as best he knew them, and nobody could hope to write an article that would be entirely without exception.

But let me read you a few of the implications from this article that I think are open to question.

He said, in effect, for many children the score on an IQ test taken early in life largely determines what further opportunities to success will be offered. I do not know of any case in which this is true. I know there are some people who regard ability, native ability, as the important thing, and talent identification, early talent identification, as early as the third grade, if you can get it, as being something that is highly important, and there are others who regard the educational process as more a process of cultivation, where the process itself is far more influential than the particular native gifts that an individual may have had. But I think the statement as it stands here represents a distortion of the actual practice of most schools in using intelligence tests.

He said again, IQ tests were once thought to be infallibly precise yardsticks. Nobody who has ever worked with intelligence tests that I know of would have held that view. There may be some people who think that you have an IQ -- that it is something that is given to you, and that a good psychologist can tell you what that IQ is, whether it is 116 or 117.

At the University of Iowa, a returning GI once came to my office to inquire whether I would give him a test, and he was willing to pay up to \$10 for the test to settle a bet as to whether his IQ was now higher than it was when he was a senior in high school. He was willing and his friend was willing to trust any score I would give him, so that the bet would be paid off if the score he got was 117 and the previous score had been 116.

No one who knows much about tests would place any reliance in differences of that magnitude.

Another point that Leggman made is that a meaningful IQ can be obtained from an individual test, but not from a group test. This, I think, is seriously open to question. For some purposes individual IQ's are clearly better. For other situations the group test has some important advantages.

I do not want to take time to go through the remainder of these statements. There have been widespread misconceptions, I think, about intelligence and its importance, and the thought I would like to leave with you is that these misconceptions are not widely shared by people who are actually working in the testing field. Those who criticize tests frequently attribute to the testers views that they do not actually hold.

Another line of criticism of testing has been a criticism of multiple choice tests. Banish Hoffman had an article in Harpers on the "Tyranny of Multiple Choice Tests." I think if he were not a mathematician and scientifically oriented, he could have had a field day taking apart some of the tests that appear in multiple choice tests the social sciences and less rigorous areas. He actually picked the hardest field in which to demonstrate shortcomings of test items. While some of these items no doubt were faulty, in other cases he put a very tortured construction on the items. It seemed to argue that if you can find the slightest shred of a reason for believing that one of the foils is in fact the correct answer, this demonstrates that the item is a poor item.

This, I think, is not true, so far as the actual performance of tests are concerned. I think he also operated a little under the assumption that a test is no stronger than its weakest item, and if you find one bad item in a test, this tends to discredit the entire test. This, again, I think is not true.

There has been criticism of external testing programs, and many of you, I think, have seen this leaflet put out by the three national associations of school men, "Testing, Testing, Testing."

There are some recommendations at the end of this booklet about local control of testing programs, about, well, such things as school officials, administrators and teachers should refrain from using the scores made by their students on a single national test as the sole measure of the qualities of their educational program. I think that is a straw man. I do not know of any school that does use the results of a single test as the sole measure of its quality.

The antithesis of this statement was that the results on these tests should be totally disregarded in evaluating the quality of a school. I think that is equally fallacious.

"Again we recommend that scholarship donors seek and follow the advice of school principals and superintendents in determining the best ways of identifying and aiding worthy students."

This, in fact, is done, and the implication that most scholarship sponsors do not follow this practice, I think is erroneous. At the Educational Testing Service, by latest count, we had involved some 350 high school teachers and college teachers in the preparations of the examinations used in wide-scale testing programs. The content of those tests is not determined by the educational testing service. It is determined primarily by committees of teachers who have been selected for their competence, and their suitability for that task.

Another recommendation, "that each student be given the right to decide whether he will participate in an external program for the purpose of awarding scholarships."

I do not know of any case in which this is not true. I can hardly imagine a school principal forcing a student to take a scholarship test. He might recommend it, but none of the scholarship programs I know involve requiring all students to take a test for the purpose of having a scholarship awarded.

Well, there is a great deal in this booklet which any conscientious educator can subscribe to. The principles are sound. And I certainly do not want to give the impression that I think scholarship programs are above criticism or external testing programs are not in need of the corrective guidance that intelligent criticism can give. But I think this publication--which incidentally was supposedly based on a survey, and a survey was actually made, but none of the survey data appears in here, the survey data were not, I understand, strongly enough in support of the position which the authors of the publication wished to take. This may be an unfair statement. I would not want to be quoted on that, but in some earlier versions there were some data reported, and they do not appear in this version of the booklet.

There have been criticisms of state testing programs, such as the Regents examinations in New York state. An Assistant Superintendent of the Great Neck schools was employed by the state commissioner of education to make some recommendations as to how to get educational research into practice in the schools. One of the recommendations he made was in effect to get rid of the Regents examinations.

Now let me read part of his report which dealt with this.

"The regents examinations, beyond any question whatsoever, inhibit educational change in the state of New York. Serious students of the matter could hardly debate the point. During May and June of 1961, the consultant visited hundreds of high school classrooms, heard what was being discussed by teachers and students, saw what was written on the blackboards, looked at the books being used in class, noted the other books students were carrying under their arms to other classes, talked briefly with many teachers, and at length with many administrators. He offers this observation, based on those visits:

"Copies of previous regents examinations constitute at least ten per cent of the curriculum in the typical high school academic course. The old examinations are the material studied for approximately four weeks out of forty. The hesitancy of many schools to break this successful pattern of preparing for regents examinations tends to dampen their enthusiasm for innovations which are distinctive in content or in approach."

The consultant was Mr. Brickel. I think Mr. Brickel is entitled to his opinion, and certainly it is true that individual teachers are going to be concerned that their students are as well prepared as possible for particular examinations that they are likely to be taking.

I sat just a few weeks ago with a committee on the regents examination that was considering the contents of a new examination in the social studies, and I would say that the teachers -- these were all teachers from New York state -- working on the content of this examination were far more concerned than the typical teacher was likely to be, that the content of the examination represented the highest scholarship and the best modern thinking as to what ought to be emphasized in secondary school teaching in the social studies.

Now you can always argue, and with justice, that it is bad for every school to be aiming at exactly the same goals, that some diversity is necessary. And I would agree with this 100 per cent. The New York state board of education, or the board of regents, has been quite generous in affording schools exemption from the regents examinations if they were engaged in an experiment, and there is nothing in the world to prevent a local system from developing its own examinations in terms of its own objectives, and using them alongside the regents examinations and presenting them as evidence that the school is actually doing an excellent job, if it is a somewhat different job than that which has been proposed by the regents.

I am convinced that the affect of the regents

examinations in stimulating consideration of what ought to be taught, and encouraging schools, which all too easily fall into the easy paths of teaching the same thing year after year, without the stimulus of challenge, without the stimulus which an examination of results is going to provide, that the influence of these examinations on the whole has been far more beneficial than harmful, and as a matter of fact, the tendency for states to adopt state testing programs has been increasing rather than diminishing. Few of them are going to adopt the pattern of the New York regents, but I would be inclined to say that they could do far worse.

Finally, in the criticism of tests there have been increasing criticisms of the use of college admissions tests, of aptitude tests for college admission, on the ground that these tests measure only part of the students qualifications and that exclusive reliance on them would deprive the college of some of the best applicants that they could get.

I think there is substance in these criticisms. It seems to me that we ought to bear in mind that very few colleges, in admitting students, do rely exclusively on the results of the test. The college board has recently published, and many of you have seen, I suppose, a handbook of class characteristics that are put out by the college entrance examination board. Even in those colleges which have the reputation for being highly selective there is a surprising proportion of students who make relatively low scores on the college board examinations. These students have been admitted for one special reason or another, but the "might" that there are certain colleges which will not accept anybody if he scores below 700 on the college board tests, is in fact a "might" and it would be extremely difficult to substantiate this by looking at the records of the students who have actually been admitted.

But those who say that there is a danger of placing too much emphasis on data of these kinds, I think their voices deserve to be heard, and the schools that have been concentrating too heavily on academic aptitude in the selection of their students need to re-examine their admissions policies, as the director of admissions at Columbia, the former director of admissions at Harvard, and a number of other leaders in this field have pointed out.

From this survey of what happened, let us turn to the current issues in the field. What are the problems that are currently concerning us most?

I am going to try to wind up my presentation in ten minutes or so, so we can have an opportunity for some exchanges of views.

One of the issues -- one we have already touched on -- is on the use of IQ tests. I will dismiss that rather

briefly by saying that from my point of view, no test ever has or ever will measure pure native intelligence. What we always measure is what a person has learned, and this is always a product of unknown proportions, of what he was born with and what opportunities he has had later on. There is no way I know of of controlling this precisely enough so that you can say, here is a score which represents his raw, native ability. Nor would there be too much use to that kind of a measure if we could get it.

Secondly, a person does not have a fixed IQ. What he gets, and all he ever gets, is an intelligence test score which is a variable quantity. It is expressed as an IQ. But any notion that any one of those numbers that you attach to a student or to yourself represents that this is how bright you are, this is the figure, that would be a fallacious notion.

Experts have less reverence than laymen, in general, for the IQ. As a matter of fact, I would go so far as to say that education would not be badly served if the notion of the IQ were to be dropped entirely. The man who invented it, the German psychologist, shortly afterwards told one of his students who was coming to America, "If you can, kill the IQ." He saw already what was happening to this concept, which was intended primarily as a convenience for expressing a test score. It was never intended to be enshrined as a sort of a figure of merit, or an index of quality of a human being.

We have already touched on the second current issue, on the use and abuse of external testing programs.

External testing does infringe on local freedom of education, but it infringes and threatens more the freedom to be mediocre or poor than the freedom to be excellent, or the freedom to innovate.

There have been frequent suggestions that equivalent scores, equivalent test scores ought to be available on different testing programs, so that if a student has taken the American College testing program, he will not need to take the College Board program, or vice versa. There are some serious practical and technical problems in doing this. You can always report that such and such a score on this test is that exceeded by a certain percentage of the group taking the test, and with a little effort you could get a similar figure for a score on another test. But whether these two tests -- for example, the scholastic aptitude, verbal and quantitative scores -- can in any way be translated or split up so you could get the four scores that are used in the American College testing program, well, this seems to me to be an almost impossible task. Actually, getting enough sophistication about what the test scores mean, to be able to interpret them in the light of your own



situation, regardless of what the scores may have been to start with, is not an overwhelming job. Anyone who is dealing with these test scores, like a registrar who is dealing with dozens or hundreds of these test scores, it seems to me should have very little difficulty in acquiring the kind of sophistication that is necessary to interpret one or the other of these scores.

Certainly no one at the Educational Testing Service, and I think no one in the American College Testing Program, would argue that a student inevitably would have to take one test, or the other, or both of them. This is a matter for colleges themselves to determine.

On the other hand, you should point out that taking a test is a learning experience. There are a great many things in common between a well constructed test and a well constructed learning program. At least superficially, there are things in common. Most educational psychologists, I think would agree that the time a student spends in taking a well constructed examination, is probably as productive educationally as the time he spends doing anything, that he is really learning during this process.

Certainly the amount of mental energy, if I can coin that phrase, that is expended during the taking of a test is likely to be greater than in almost any other kind of activity. Even if he never sees the scores again, the mere fact of his working through these exercises is in itself of educational value.

Another issue -- and this is one that I consider far more important than the two I have just mentioned, is the point of view with regard to human beings and education that is fostered by alternative approaches to testing. I think this can best be summarized by saying that some people regard education as essentially like a mining process. The main problem is to find where the ore is; the process of extracting the ore, of developing it, if you please, is a relatively easy job.

There are others who say, no, education is not like mining, it is more like farming. You have to have a certain minimum of natural conditions, of soil fertility, and climate, and rainfall, and so on, in order to grow a crop. But once you have those conditions, what you produce and how much you produce depends far more on how you till the soil than what was in the soil to start with.

Now I lean in the direction, if I can use this crude analogy, of the farming concept. I would far rather see our tests be used to guide the educational process, to help the individual choose the kind of experiences he needs, and can profit from, than to see it used primarily as a selection device. I sometimes find myself at odds with

even those in our own organization who are interested in developing a network of test scores. They would like to take the school and college ability test, given as low as the third or fourth grade, and see what the relation is between those scores and scores on the scholastic aptitude test and then what is the relation between scores on the scholastic aptitude test, and the graduate record application, so you could make a prediction of how well he would do when he took the graduate record examination some fifteen years later.

I think this is undesirable. It may be interesting to do it, but if it were to tempt us to shut off opportunities from some individuals, and to concentrate our attention on other individuals, it seems to me that this would be extremely harmful.

Another current issue is this: Do or do not external testing programs restrict the freedom of the school to develop its own curriculum?

I have mentioned Mr. Bickels' notion that the regents examinations do inhibit curricular innovation. I have also mentioned that from my point of view the work of these test committees in considering what ought to be in the curriculum is highly important, and without this, without this kind of consensus, modified each year, as the sense of the educational community grows, education would not advance nearly so fast.

I think we are in a dangerous situation if we insist on the right of each individual teacher -- whether at the college level, or the high school level -- to set up his own values and define for himself alone what it means to know how school chemistry or college chemistry or educational psychology should be taught. As a matter of fact, in practical terms, nobody can get away with that even if he wanted to, because his students, presumably having had a course in this field, are going to be judged by others as to whether or not they have been adequately prepared.

"Wide scale external tests can be, and should be supplemented by local tests." The issue -- this I guess is the fifth one on my list -- is the old issue of objective tests versus essay tests. Essay tests, I am convinced, can be as good as objective tests, but it is harder to make them so. It takes more effort. I am not, in saying this, diminishing the problem of making good objective examinations. What I am emphasizing is the difficulty of arriving at reliable evaluations of essay examinations. It is quite possible, in fact, it is almost inevitable, that essay examinations have unique contributions to make to the assessment of an individual's achievements. The tragedy is that those unique contributions almost always get lost in what we call errors of measurement, the unreliability

of evaluation.

If you want to predict what kind of a score a student will make on an essay test of writing, you can do a better job of that prediction if you give him an objective test of writing ability, than if you give him another essay test of writing ability.

That was demonstrated in a fairly extensive study that was made by the College Board and the Educational Testing Service. In spite of that, as you know, the writing sample is back in the College Board's program, at the insistence of people who believe, probably with justification, that this kind of a goal is important for high school teachers. You need to keep before them the problem of teaching students to write, and to write with reasonable facility.

Objective examinations are no longer, if they ever were, justifiably criticized as being superficial tests of factual memory. An objective question can be made as thought provoking as the situation warrants. In fact, one of our problems is to make them so that they are not too thought provoking, because if they are, nobody gets them right, and the test question does not serve any useful purpose.

Most of the important decisions that people make, the decisions that you make, the decisions that I make, the decisions the President of the United States has to make, are not decisions in which he has to figure out something new. Ordinarily, they are decisions between alternatives where the alternatives are clearly known. It is only the consequences that we cannot foretell.

President Kennedy's much criticized and much defended decision not to supply air cover to the invasion of Cuba is an example of a multiple choice problem, "shall I, or shall I not?" Francis Stockton's story, "The Lady or the Tiger," is a multiple choice situation. "This door, when I know what the consequences will be, or this door when I know pretty well what the consequences will be."

I would suggest that most of our problems are of that character, and the charge is not justified, I would repeat, if it ever was, that an objective question is simply a question of recognition or of sheer factual memory.

Another issue is related to the measurement of non-cognitive outcomes of education, and for various aspects of personality.

I am sure my ears will be pinned back when I say this, as they have been pinned back on previous occasions

when I have said it, but at the risk of being provoking, I am going to say it again. I seriously question whether any institution of higher education should be concerned with a student's personality, or his attitudes, or his values, as a basis for admitting the student; or should judge the effectiveness of its educational program by changes that have been made in those attitudes, values, or that personality structure, except in so far as -- and this is an important exception -- you can change a student's attitudes and values and personality by making him more aware of the consequences of certain kinds of actions, certain kinds of behavior.

It is possible in at least two ways to change the behavior of an individual. One is by conditioning him, by making him like to do certain things, by rewarding him when he does it, even though the rewarding is irrelevant to what he has done, and by making him shun other things by punishing him when he does those things. This is the simple, animal type of condition and some of it goes on in colleges.

We could not avoid it, if we wanted to. An attractive, persuasive professor is likely to make his students like the subject that he is teaching them. And if the college environment is an attractive environment, the students are going to like education more than if the atmosphere is unattractive. This is conditioning, and not rational. I think we tread a dangerous ground if we should as college faculty members, or college administrators, say we are going to set up the situation in this college so that our students become highly religious -- not on rational grounds, but because we make the religious life attractive to them, with all of the surroundings, because, you see, if you can do that with religious life, you can also do it to make communists out of them (if that represents the anti-thesis), or you can manipulate behavior in any other way.

This process of conditioning, which we sometimes refer to in another context as "brainwashing," seems to me to be something which institutions of higher education ought to approach with the utmost caution.

The Educational Policies Committee has recently come out with a bulletin on the central purpose of education. It says the central purpose is a rational, cognitive purpose, teaching individuals how to think. This is not to say for a moment that those eminent men felt that any one of us is a pure, cold, disembodied intellect. We are not. We have aches and pains. We have fears and loves. We have all sorts of emotional involvements, and we cannot get away from them, but there are two ways of helping us to deal with them. One is by means of understanding, and the other is by this means of conditioning.

People who are concerned with the values of students and think that they ought to do something about

those values, by other means than by means of intellectual development, seem to me to be abdicating the primary responsibility of an institution of higher education.

DEAN NYGREEN: What does this say about the teaching of interpersonal and civic responsibility?

MR. EBEL: I think it says that unless interpersonal and civic responsibility can be made to be a reasonably desirable course of action, in terms of its consequences, we ought not to teach it. Unless integration, say, or racial tolerance is a good way of behaving because of the evidence that history has given us, because of what logical analysis of the consequences of various kinds of behavior reveal to us, then I say we ought not to do it.

DEAN NYGREEN: Then you would not encourage an attitude toward integration in a segregationist society, because it is uncomfortable to the segregationist in such a society?

MR. EBEL: I think not. I would take the larger view, and the more long-run view, and say we have to look beyond this year, or this particular community. It is not just being comfortable for the moment, or being comfortable in this particular corner of the world.

DEAN NYGREEN: Or in my generation?

MR. EBEL: Or even in my generation, yes. I think even in my generation.

DEAN GEORGE H. WATSON (Dean of Students, Roosevelt University): Is being comfortable good, ever? And where are you going to derive your values in this system you are proposing?

MR. EBEL: I think being comfortable is good, and I like to be comfortable. As a matter of fact, I wish I could manage my life so that I were more comfortable, a greater share of the time.

Now you might say, well you could if you would just content yourself with being a vegetable, if you did not worry about these problems of the world any more.

I do not think this is possible. H. G. Wells and others have dreamed up a society in which comfort was maximized by dividing human beings into two types, the thinkers and the others who were not thinkers. I do not think it is possible for me to get out of the struggle of living. But I think the goal in the struggle is always to achieve comfort -- not necessarily only for myself. This is where intelligence, I think, comes into play too.

I was not a service man myself, and I cannot claim veteran's status, but among those who died, and who died young, and died knowing what they were fighting for -- and this probably was not all of them -- it seems to me that you can have nothing but praise for them.

Let me quote Bertrand Russell -- he may not be a good authority to quote in my behalf here, but I think it is pertinent to this issue.

"The question arises whether education should train good individuals for good citizens. It may be said, and it would be said by any person of Hegelian tendencies, that there could be no antithesis between the good citizen and the good individual. The good individual is he who ministers to the good of the whole, and the good of the whole is the pattern made up of the goods of individuals."

As an ultimate metaphysical truth, I am not prepared either to combat or to support this thesis. But in practical, daily life, the education which results from regarding a child as an individual is very different from that which results from regarding him as a future citizen.

I have great respect for President Kennedy, but I think what he has been telling us is that our primary duty is to the state, as citizens. "Ask not what we can do for you; ask what you can do for the state." Without intending any disrespect at all, I see a parallel between that attitude, which may be quite necessary now, and the attitude which called on the loyalty of the Nazis to the state and to the party.

I think there are dangers inherent in it, and I think it involves a denial of the old Greek ideal of regarding each individual as an individual, and his own welfare as the paramount goal.

Let me continue: "The education which results from regarding a child as an individual is very different from that which results from regarding him as a future citizen. The cultivation of the individual mind is not, on the face of it, the same thing as the production of a useful citizen."

I think what I am arguing is for the cultivation of the individual mind. Boyd Bode, from Ohio State University, said at the conclusion of his book "How We Learn," that democracy must win on this basis, or it cannot win at all. If it is not the kind of society which can survive when individuals are free to make their own choices, it is not the kind of a society which deserves to survive, and I would submit to you that those choices ought to be informed choices; that there ought not to be a person or a committee or an educational institution off in the wings here

manipulating the situation, as you can manipulate it, so that the individuals behave in ways that we have predetermined that we want them to behave, and not in ways which they have been able to choose for themselves.

DEAN NYGREEN: Yes, but I just want to twist this a little bit now. Not the point of predetermined ways of behaving, but take the point of how does one inculcate a notion of loyalty? I am not talking about loyalty to the state; I am talking about the generalized notion of interpersonal dependence, one's loyalty to one's family, to those with whom one shares whatever eventuality occurs. This may in some instances be the state, I grant, but that is not what I am talking about. How does one teach this, as opposed to the complete individual, self satisfaction which seems implied by the way you state your position?

MR. EBEL: The way I would approach it -- and I have never done this, so I may be on very shaky grounds --

DEAN NYGREEN: Well, we have all the advantage of attacking you, you understand. (Laughter)

MR. EBEL: -- in saying that it ought to be done this way. But it seems to me that insofar as I have learned loyalty -- and I think I have learned loyalty -- it is by seeing the consequences in my own life and in the lives of others of disloyalty.

DEAN NYGREEN: Excuse me. Just that point. Does not the university or college, as the institution, at this point have the responsibility to teach those consequences? You see, you were saying a little earlier, you teach knowledge, you do not necessarily teach adherence to any particular frame of reference. My question is right there.

MR. EBEL: Well, I think this is it. I would regard this as knowledge. Benedict Arnold probably is not a good example of a disloyal individual, but certainly in the educational background of almost every individual there is the story of Benedict Arnold and what happened to him. This I say is a cognitive approach to loyalty. The alternative is to dress people in uniforms so that they look alike, or in other ways condition them, where you do not give them the freedom of choosing, that they will do this or that they will not do it.

Knowledge of the society in which you live and the attitudes of other people, right or wrong, is part of this cognitive background. Maybe there is no disagreement between us. I hope not.

DEAN NYGREEN: I do not think there is.

MR. EBEL: I would go with you 100 per cent in saying that some behavior tendencies, ethical principles, resistance to temptation to cheat, all of these things are important.

DEAN NYGREEN: When we get then to the question of what we use tests for in the college situation, the thing that is behind my comment is this, that the tests are merely part of the atmosphere which you try to create within the campus environment, and that in some ways tests of attitudes, tests of personality characteristics, and the things which come from this -- you began your position here by saying that you thought this was none of the business of a college, and I am merely trying to say, part of the business of the college must be some concern for that atmosphere. And at this point, tests have a very real contribution to make. I think you are shortchanging your own subject here, and that is what I am trying to say.

MR. EBEL: Well, this is a good point, and it leads to something else that I wanted to say. I have been privileged for the last few years of serving on the Committee on Measurement and Evaluation of the American Council of Education. This very question came up at the last meeting of that committee. Dr. Logan Wilson is at present our executive secretary of the American Council, and was there.

The question came up, if you had a good test of neural systems, would you give it to your students, and would you exclude the students who scored high on a neurotic scale? Would you say, we do not want these individuals around, we think they are trouble makers. The consensus of the group was we should not do that.

You can carry this over, do you want to exclude some one who thinks that football is absolutely silly, that a college should not be engaged in it? Obviously, you do not want to do that.

There are three questions (and I am not making a very well organized presentation here). One is quality of these tests of personality and so on. The other is, even if they were good, would we want to use them? I have serious reservations about the quality of most of them that are currently available to us. It is not that I do not think each of us has a personality which our best friends could tab pretty clearly -- whether we are aggressive or complacent, whether we are outgoing, gregarious, or withdrawn. There are all of these characteristics which people who know us well could specify.

But there are serious difficulties in getting a student to reveal this on a test if the answer is going to make any difference to him.



DEAN NYGREEN: But you can get him to consider these things, if he feels fairly confident that the answers of the test are not going to change what happens to him. Then he has to deal with this idea. It is now part of his thinking, which it may not have been before.

MR. EBEL: I would certainly be willing to have a student take these personality tests, and check what the test tells him about himself against what he knows, and to use it for this kind of self information. What I would object to doing is having these tests used as a basis for selection or for other ways of manipulating the individual.

Well, I promised to stop at around three-thirty, and out time is moving on. Let me just run quickly through what I said -- what I was going to say about the future.

If you were to ask people, what are the major problems remaining before educational measurement specialists, one answer you might get is, "we need measure motivation." I think that is false. I do not think we are ever going to get a measure of motivation. Others might say we need a measure of creativity. I think also this is a false hope. "We need a measure of native intelligence." I have indicated why I think this is a false hope. "We need to find the structure of intellect." The test builders have been working on this for a long time and I do not think there is the kind of a structure that they are looking for. "We need to close the gap in prediction." Our tests now correlate with grades, point 5, if we are lucky, point 6, and other people say, why can't we make it point 9 or point 99. Again, I think this is a false hope, and I am not even sure that if it were possible it would be a good thing to do. If it were possible, I am sure we would do it. I am a little bit glad it is not possible.

There are two dangers, I think, that we need to avoid in this area of educational testing.

One is over-simplification, assuming that all of the mental life is very simple, that there are six factors in it, as Thurston originally postulated, or maybe there are two factors only Schurman postulated.

The other, and this is the more serious danger, is the danger of verbal mysticism. We invent words for things, and then assume that having invented the word, we have explained them somehow. People ask us for tests of these things, motivation, creativity, native intelligence, long before they have ever defined what the term means. To define any one of these terms is to take the first step, if not the only necessary step, in getting it measured. The reason we do not have tests for these things is because they are sort of fuzzy terms that we use in different ways, in different contexts.

So I am concerned about this mysticism that pervades much of our psychological thinking. There are some real problems, it seems to me. What we need is a clearer perception of the nature of the educational product.

What is learning? When I took educational psychology, more years ago than I care to remember, the professor said, "There are no neurophysiological correlates of learning. You cannot tell by doing anything to a person's brain whether he has learned anything or not."

We are close to a period when that answer will no longer be true. The neurophysiologists have been tying their work in with learning theories in ways which are a lot more close and more promising than they ever were before.

In the field of testing we need better and clearer test specifications, more efficient processes for producing tests, more meaningful test scores, better communication of test information.

I was delighted when -- this again may be a controversial comment -- the Commissioner of Education in New York State said, "Test score records ought to be public information." If they are meaningful, then the meaning can be communicated, and it seems to me it ought to be communicated.

I resent the idea that anybody else ought to know more about me than I know about myself, or that anyone should know more about my children than I know about them. I likewise resent doctors when they put me off with a vague answer then I ask about my blood pressure or some other report. I feel that I ought to know, if this is something that is related to me and to my welfare.

We need a better definition of terms that we use in behavior reports. In general, I hold out much more hope for systematizing the reports that individuals make about other individuals, in terms of judging what their personalities are than in anything which the individual can be tricked into revealing himself -- not that he will reveal himself if the matter makes no difference to him, but most of the situations where I would like personality data it is not situations where it would make a difference. Somebody that I want to employ, or not to employ, and in situations like that, self reports are subject to serious limitations.

Finally, I think we need improved standard measures of educational attainment. I have not really done justice to this, or to look to the future of what is likely to happen, but I think I have imposed on your patience more than I should, and I would be delighted if we could take a little time now for discussion, in addition to what good discussion we have already had.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Thank you very much, Dr. Ebel. I am sure you have given us a lot to think about, and a lot of information which many of us have not had.

We do have a few more minutes for questions, and I am sure some of you have some. I want you to feel free to raise them.

DEAN DUDLEY JENKS (Drexel Institute of Tech.): I am a little bit disturbed that you say it is a false hope that we can ever measure motivation. It seems to me this is a key problem in counseling students.

MR. EBEL: Motivation is a fairly global term. I think it is as impossible to measure motivation as it is to measure culture in society. Motivation, as we are concerned about it, is motivation in pursuit of particular objects.

An individual is highly motivated, so highly motivated that he runs all sorts of risks and one day holds up a bank, and he is extremely active and aggressive; he is caught, put into jail, perhaps put into solitary confinement. What happens to his motivation? It just goes to zero.

If we think of motivation as something which a person has inside him, like a spring that is wound up loose or tight, and that we can tell about his motivation apart from the situation in which he finds himself, I think this is a forlorn hope.

I do think that we can learn a lot about how to motivate individuals, and some of the best books on educational psychology deal with the question of how you can motivate an individual.

I am quite sure, as I found to my sorrow, that it was impossible to motivate some people to do some things. My daughter never felt highly motivated to learn to be a speedy and accurate typist. There was nothing that I could do. Maybe I just was not skillful enough in arranging the situation to motivate her there in that direction.

But I do not see any possibility of measuring this general term of motivation. Almost everyone thinks that we ought to. They see students who are not working up to capacity. But as George Kelly, who is an educational psychologist at Ohio State University, said in a book called "The Assessment of Human Motives," -- Gardiner Lindsey of Minnesota edited the book. George Kelly has a chapter in there in which he said he thinks that educational psychology could do without the concept of motivation. He says it is primarily part of a language of complaint of teachers. He talked about his early experience in Kansas where he had

gone around trying to help teachers, and they would say, "I am having a problem with Bill here. He just has no motivation. I need to motivate him. How can I motivate him?"

Kelly would say, "Now what would happen to Bill if you did not motivate him?"

The teacher would say, "He would just sit."

Kelly said, my suggestion was, well, why don't you just let him sit and slyly observe what goes on while he is just sitting. He said, inevitably these teachers would report some very interesting goings on, when they took the pressure off Bill and just watched what he did when he was not being pressured, and Kelly said for the first time they got an insight into the kind of a world in which Bill was living, which was not the kind of a world that the teacher imagined at all.

Well, what I am indicating here is the kind of general view of personality as being an interaction between an individual with a certain past history, and the situation in which he finds himself. We can find out some things about his past history. We can find some things about the situation in which he finds himself, and then we can make some predictions about how he is going to behave.

A distant relative of mine went to college after a long layoff, and it was a reasonably safe prediction that he was going to drop out after he had been in college for a semester, because this was the pattern of his activities in the past, and there was nothing in what had happened, or in his new situation that suggested any change. I think that would have been a fairly good prediction. But to talk in terms of how much motivation he had, I think, would be a serious oversimplification. He had a considerable motivation to sell cars, but not much motivation to get a liberal education.

DEAN RALPH A. YOUNG (College of Wooster): Would you be willing to rate the factors in admission, especially these three: Class rank, test score, and personal recommendations. How do you rank those factors, or don't you rank them at all?

MR. EBEL: I would like to be able to rank them all almost in the reverse order of which you gave them. As a matter of fact, if I can toot my own horn here a little bit (forgive me for this), the College Board Review about two years ago has a piece that I wrote in which I suggested that the ideal basis for college admissions, it seemed to me, would be the disciplined recommendation of a high school principal or counselor, and by the disciplined recommendation, I meant one that the principal or counselor would be held responsible for.

If the admissions officer says to the principal, where is this boy likely to rank, in which fifth is he likely to rank after a year in college, if I were a high school principal, as I was once, I would certainly want to know something about the college, the scores on the college board or other examinations, what kind of a score this kid gave. But I think I could beat the computing machine any day, as an informed principal with all of this data that I could integrate myself, and this it seems to me would be the ideal basis for admission.

If the admissions officer were to go back to the high school principal and say, look here, you have been giving us some pretty sour recommendations lately, they haven't panned out. So that would be my Number One choice.

As between the other two, rank in class and test scores, this is pretty hard to nail down, because in some instances, some high schools, rank in class would be better than test scores. In other cases, it would be poorer, but I would put them pretty much on a par.

DEAN SHELTON L. BEATTY (Pomona College): I do not like to ask you to stay on your feet longer about a subject that you have been discussing, but one of the vaguest and loosest terms in America, so closely related to motivation, is procrastination. It is one of the most serious vices of many a student with high test scores and with a rather satisfactory rank in his graduating class in high school. I know it is another name for not knowing what motivation is in a given instance.

Would you make an evaluation of procrastination in relation to motivation and give us an intelligent discourse of what is being done in discovering the causes of procrastination, academic procrastination?

MR. EBEL: I am not sure that I can make a very intelligent comment.

DEAN BEATTY: I did not mean to insult you.  
(Laughter) I meant, would you enlighten us.

MR. EBEL: But I really have misgivings about what I can say about procrastination. I recognize it. I think, like motivation, it is a product of the particular environment in which a particular individual finds himself, and his past history. I know pretty well of a student who on any reasonable measure of procrastination would have made a high score. That is, he was a very able procrastinator. (Laughter) And the reason why he was so, I am convinced, was because he enjoyed so much -- this is a strange thing to say -- he enjoyed the process of studying so much that when he had a paper to write, he would read, and read, and read endlessly, and the day before his paper was due, I would ask him, "How

is the paper coming?" "Well, I am going to start it tonight but there is another reference I want to read first." All of my urgings that "you ought to outline the paper two weeks before it is due and begin to discipline yourself," was of little avail. This young man had some difficulties in adjusting to college, and I think college counselors frequently report that individuals who are used to intensive reading, to reading each sentence in the book -- they are given a long book list to read in college, with the expectation that they are going to hit the high spots, and skim, and many of them have a terrible problem in getting over this.

Well, this is only one clinical case of procrastination. I am sure there are very many others. I think getting around it is an educational problem. This is the easy answer to any one of these things. Maybe we should not get around it in all cases. It may be that the person who takes a long time, deliberately to work on things, may have some unique contributions to make.

I once had a graduate assistant who was quite different from any I had ever had before, because I would give him enough work, I thought, to keep him out of my hair for three or four weeks, and the next day he would be back with all of these things done, and ready for more, and he just ran me ragged, in trying to keep him busy -- maybe I am a procrastinator. The things were not terribly well done, but his impulse was to get it off the desk, get it finished. And his later career has shown him to be highly productive. He has written a number of books. I haven't written any.

It seemed to me that he was sacrificing quality for speed, but he was quite the opposite of a procrastinator and I suspect that perhaps some individuals who may only produce one major book or article may have actually made a greater contribution than one who is highly productive. This is a little bit off the point, I think --

DEAN BEATTY: He might not stay in college long enough to produce one year's record, the way some people procrastinate.

MR. EBEL: This is certainly true.

DEAN BEATTY: He is not a person of low ability by any means, necessarily.

MR. EBEL: That is right.

DEAN JOSEPH W. WALT (Simpson College): I am disturbed by the comment you made, and it is certainly true that SCAT is a measure of learning. I take it that high school grades are also supposed to be a measure of learning

and I realize there is not always a correlation between the two, because the SCAT is for us a sine qua non for admission and for many here, too. The student puts a terrific emphasis on the importance of scores, a good deal more perhaps than the colleges do. Nevertheless, it is a disturbing thing to him, it seems to bother him terribly, and the very fact that a condition of Board membership is virtually the executive requirement of this particular examination, this is the thing that bothers me, is the fact that institutions exclusively require this test because they want to be listed as a board member. This also bothers a lady sitting here in front of me, who is with a high school, because of this deep concern that students have. On SAT morning our kids are engaged in a nationwide academic bingo game. This really does disturb them deeply. Is this the problem, that the CEEB requires this thing, or part of it?

MR. EBEL: The College Board examines its own conscience frequently on this matter. There are a great many institutions that would like to be board member colleges, and to participate in the making of decisions that the board makes, and get other benefits, one of which is a certain aura of prestige, but do not like to require their students to take the college board tests.

As recently as the last two weeks there was a committee or a group of trustees debating just how far they could go in relaxing this requirement.

The fact that a college is required to make complete, or almost complete use of the SAT, with its students, does not say anything about how much emphasis the college has to place on these tests in admission.

I would say that from the students I know, there is as much concern, or perhaps more, with the grades they are making in school as with the scores that they make on the test. Now, it may be that they are too much concerned. We have done some studies about how students react to these scores, how they take them. A great many students are taking them more than once now, as you know, and they know from their own experience that these scores are not fixed, that they can vary quite widely. Sometimes they go down. Sometimes students do better as juniors than they do as seniors.

I really doubt that any college-bound student is being emotionally or educationally harmed very much by having taken the college board examinations.

Beyond making that general statement, I am not sure that I can document it too well.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: May I ask, you mentioned the fact that it was difficult, or there was not too much

correlation between the ability to predict grades and the college boards yet, but you hoped to be able to improve this.

MR. EBEL: It is pretty good by general going standards, but it is far from perfect prediction.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: The thing that worries me is the possibility of making this perfect -- or isn't it the possibility that as the college boards achieve more and more importance on the part of the colleges and the high schools that you are going to bring about this higher correlation by having the high schools prepare for the taking of the tests, and therefore the tests will test what they will be taking better than what they are taking now?

MR. EBEL: It might have this effect. It might also have the opposite effect. We have the hardest time to show a high correlation between test scores and grades, in the highly selective institutions. This is where the prediction is poorest because, for example, if there is an institution for which 90 per cent of the students are above 700 on the college board, well there is not much difference in their test scores which you can relate to the differences in the grades that they get.

If the highschools begin to prepare for the scholastic aptitude tests -- and incidentally this is an extremely difficult thing to do. The reason why it is so extremely difficult is the wide range of material that is covered. You can work pretty intensively to improve a student's vocabulary, and the chances of your having taught him a word that appears in that examination, because there are so many tens of thousands of words that could be used, crucial words, the chance of preparing them is pretty small.

I think it is not likely that many schools will devote a substantial amount of their time to preparing for the tests. Certainly it is educationally unwise to do this. If you are interested in the educational welfare of the student, there is no high school, I think, that can justify devoting much of its time to preparing students. Maybe a little time to teaching them what the strategy of good performance on the examination is.

I was appalled, taking my own son to take the college board examinations, to hear him say to his companion who was also going along with us, "Well I'm going to look through the test first and pick out the hard questions and answer them."

I said, "What in the world for, Dave?"

He said, "Well, they'll count more." This was the stereotype he had from his high school examinations, the tough questions always counted more. But in the college



board examinations this is not true at all. If just a little bit of savvy can be imparted to the students, as to how to give an honest account of their abilities, this I think is good. And perhaps on the math section, for juniors and seniors, giving them a review of math, this also could be educationally desirable.

I would certainly say that any high school which began to devote more than a very small fraction of its time, much less than ten per cent, to working specifically on the examination, would be giving its students a bad bargain, and not actually helping them very much to get into college.

DEAN EDGAR C. DEBOLT (Upsala College): In your correlation studies, have you any correlations of the predictive value of a so-called aptitude test versus a good achievement test, in relation to college success? And particularly as one might compare the SAT and the STEP. Now I have the impression in certain quarters there is a feeling, a strong feeling, that the STEP is as good or better a prediction of success over the SAT. Would you care to comment on that?

MR. EBEL: Yes. I think that a combination of three achievement tests -- and this is what students who take the achievement tests and the college board ordinarily take -- will run a very close second to the scholastic aptitude test, and may in some cases actually give better predictions of college success than the aptitude test.

I sense a trend away from aptitude testing, in the direction of achievement testing. The problem is, of course, that some achievement tests get pretty specific, and the great virtue of an aptitude test is that it is broad and general. It deals with things like language and mathematics, which are common to almost all of our activities. If you begin to get chemistry, or particularly advanced placement chemistry, something even more narrow, you lose some of this advantage of generality. But you gain the advantage, I think -- well, what seems to me the basic principle of education, that all learning builds on previous learning. There was a cartoon once of a psychologist talking to a mother and a little girl, and the psychologist was saying to the mother, "But, ma'am, it is not enough that your child is a genius, she must be a genius at something." You have to have this subject matter competence, this developed ability. Just aptitude is not enough.

The scholastic aptitude tests, as I indicated, have many of the attributes of an achievement test, but it does not go quite as far as some of the others.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: May I suggest that we have one more question, because it is ten minutes after now.

DEAN JAMES J. MCPADDEN (Catholic University): I agree that the taking of the test is a learning experience. I also feel that the interpretation should be a learning experience. It has been my experience that some people flunk this end of it, that they do not come out with what they should.

At one time I thought it might have been the fault of the counselor, but I am convinced now that they are clear. But it is the kid himself who comes out with definite misconceptions. Have you noticed this experience, and if so, what can be done about it?

MR. EBEL: Well the College Board wrestled for a long time with itself -- and it wrestled with admissions officers, I must say, too -- before it agreed to release test scores. And when it did, it was with the understanding that they would produce some interpretive material. There is a leaflet like this, "Your College Board Scores, Scholastic Aptitude Test, Achievement Tests." Here is another one, "Your College Board Scores, Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test."

They have produced documents like this which go a long way, it seems to me, toward making the interpretation of the scores reasonable and accurate. Unfortunately, in some high schools and colleges people deal with these test scores who are not themselves far ahead of the students. I am not quite willing to absolve the counselors from all blame. The situation is improving, and I am sure we ought to be getting back at the students, but for years we could not do this, because the college board members, member colleges, said, "no, this is secret information."

I think this is one of the most important moves toward the improvement of the interpretation of test results, that of making them more widely available, taking them out from under the table, where you can, and indeed have to talk about them. Things are being done. The situation is not ideal yet, but I think we are making real progress.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Ralph, we will give you a bonus.

DEAN YOUNG: There has been a rumor about -- I do not know if it is factual or not -- but the verbal section of the aptitude test is a better indicator than the mathematics section. Is this just an old wives' tale?

MR. EBEL: No, this is true. In engineering or science, the math runs a close second to the verbal, or may run it better, but because of the greater generality of verbal thinking and communication than math, the verbal test is generally the better predictor.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Incidentally, we have found at Beloit that the math is a better predictor for men, and the verbal for girls.

Again, Dr. Ebel, we would like to thank you for being with us, and it has been very informative and interesting, and we hope you will come again.

MR. EBEL: Thank you very much. It has been a pleasure.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Thank you for coming.

... The meeting of Seminar VII recessed at four-fifteen o'clock ...

---

## CONFERENCE BANQUET

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

The Conference Banquet convened at seven-five o'clock, Vice-President-Designate John P. Gwin presiding.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: May I ask that we all stand, please, while Dean David Robinson gives the invocation.

DEAN DAVID W. ROBINSON (Dean of Student Affairs, Emory University): Our Heavenly Father, we humbly thank you for the privilege this day, and the pleasure of this gathering in which we share food and fellowship.

We pause at this annual banquet to offer our appreciation for those who have gone before us, in serving you through the lives of students.

We ask the blessings of love and guidance to strengthen us and our associates on campuses throughout our great country, to strengthen all educators to stand spiritually straight in the purity of your light.

As we approach the close of our convention, which was opened in friendship and was conducted in an aura of respect, may it conclude in harmony when we will seek Your Grace, and remain with us as we go to our work and homes, humble yet refreshed, knowing that although our work is not done, neither are the opportunities to utilize the forces of your love within us. We are blessed by this love. May we always be aware of the privilege to serve when it unfolds to us. Amen.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: May I have your attention, please. Before you start to eat, and in order to save time later, I would like to make two special announcements, and in the first I would like to request your cooperation.

Tomorrow morning at nine a.m. sharp we are going to have our business session. There are several reports to be made, and action to be taken, so I am hopeful that all of you will set your alarm clocks about fifteen minutes earlier, for those who are slow risers, and a half hour earlier for those who take a little more time, so we can get started on time in the morning. Nine a.m. sharp, an important business meeting.

On your tables, you will have found a copy of a resolution which is going to be presented tomorrow. It is given to you tonight for procedural reasons, so you will have an opportunity to read it over, study it carefully, for action will be asked tomorrow. I am going to very quickly read it over, just to make sure you hear it, even if you do not read it.

RESOLUTION III PROPOSED TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF  
N.A.S.P.A. BY UNANIMOUS VOTE OF COMMISSION VI

Whereas, the fifty state commissions proposed to administer a federal national scholarship program will create still more agencies which students needing financial assistance must seek out and consult, will create still more agencies which colleges must consult in determining financial awards to students, will thus create even greater complexity for students and colleges in the administration of financial aid programs; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators strongly recommends that the proposed federal national scholarship program be administered directly through the colleges and universities, as the federal loan program is now administered, and not through new state commissions.

... Dinner was served ...

CHAIRMAN GWIN: May we get on with the program, please.

As you will notice on your program, Lyle Reynolds, Dean of Students at the University of California at Santa Barbara is supposed to be your Toastmaster this evening. Unfortunately, Lyle has developed a throat infection and is unable to be here this evening. I hope that you will be able to bear with me in my attempts to fill his place.

I would like, on behalf of the officers of the Association, to welcome you to our Forty-Fourth Anniversary Banquet. Tonight's dinner, I feel, provides an opportunity for all of us to break bread together in the true NASPA spirit of humility and friendship. Tonight for a few hours we leave behind us our worries of riots, disturbed students, college board tests, disciplinary actions, and enjoy the company of men who dedicated their lives to the education of youth and practiced the principles of fair play long before NSA and the American Civil Liberties Union toyed with the phrase "due process." (Laughter and applause)

We have labored hard these last two days, speaking, listening, thinking, in an effort to better prepare ourselves for our daily task. Indeed we have met night and day in large and small groups, practically running from one meeting to another, in order to gather as much information as possible. In fact at times I have, I am sure, experienced somewhat the same sensations as the inebriated gentleman who walking home decided to take a short cut through the fields. Climbing over one fence, he stumbled, turned around and bumped into the same fence, climbed over the fence, stumbled, turned around, stumbled into the same fence, and after doing this five or six times, breathlessly hanging on to the fence,

said to himself, "Either these are the smallest fields I have ever been in, or I'm traveling at a terrific rate of speed."  
(Laughter)

At times I am sure we have felt this way, yet I am sure, to a man, you will agree that our energy spent has been rewarded by thought provoking speeches, stimulating discussions, acquisition of new ideas and thoughts, and fun.

Tonight we are here for both fun and stimulation. Before getting into the main portion of the program, however, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce some wonderful people to you, and I should first like to introduce the ladies at the head table.

On my left is Mrs. Stewart, next is Mrs. Knox, Mrs. Weaver, Mrs. Clevenger; and on my right, Mrs. McLeod, Mrs. Nygreen, and Mrs. Carl Grip. (Applause)

Now may I ask all of the ladies in the audience who are our guests, some of our wives, and visitors, if they will please stand, because I think these always add beauty to our meeting. (Applause as all the ladies arose)

Now I know we have all had an opportunity to meet many of our Freshmen visitors tonight and during the last two days, but I wonder if the wearers of the Green Ribbon would mind standing tonight so we can see how many of you are here. (Applause as the Green Ribbon wearers arose)

The two gentlemen I am now going to ask to rise, certainly have no need for introduction, however, I think it is an excellent opportunity for us to express our appreciation to two wonderful guys who have practically raised this Association and made it what it is today. Words are inadequate to express our appreciation, so may I just ask Fred Turner and Shorty Nowotny if they will please stand. (Applause as they arose)

For the neophytes in the group, I should tell you that Fred Turner has served as Secretary of this organization for some twenty-one years, and has been a member since 1924. Shorty has provided much leadership and stimulation, and many wonderful stories since 1928, and has been a real service to us in helping us organize our Placement Service.

Now I would like to pay tribute to those people who have worked so hard these last two days, and tomorrow will still be working hard, those who have been responsible for helping us organize and run the program.

First I would like to thank Bill Toombs who, unfortunately, is not here tonight. Bill is in the Navy, and they are having a Navy inspection this evening, so Bill has to be absent.

Bob Longley has been in charge of the tours for our visit here. Is Bob here? Well, we will say thanks to him anyway.

Ray Whittaker -- is Ray here? Ray has had charge of the press and publicity relations for the conference.

The exhibits, which were wonderfully done again, were completed by Bob Crane who unfortunately is ill and cannot be here tonight; and Dudley Jencks. Is Mr. Jencks here? Will you please stand? (Applause)

Mr. George Letchworth, Registration Chairman, is he present? (Applause)

Richard Solomon -- he is sleeping. He was the manager of the conference office, which is quite a job.

Now the most important person probably of all, who has been working practically day and night and doing it very willingly, Miss Marilyn Smith, Secretary to Dean Carl Grip. Marilyn, will you please stand? (Applause)

Of course, without a general chairman in charge of the local arrangements, our Host Dean Carl Grip, who has done a wonderful job I think. (Applause)

We have quite a few visitors, as you know, in the audience representing other organizations, and I wonder if Don Winbigler would please come up and introduce our visitors.

DEAN WINBIGLER: Mr. Toastmaster, Ladies and Gentlemen: I don't wonder that Jack has referred to these wearers of the Green as "Blue Ribbons." They are quite blue ribbon "greenies," as I have had a chance to get acquainted with them.

There are a number of representatives of other Associations in our audience, and I have an apology to make because I am not really very sure about them. I set out to try to find out this afternoon, but I just read the literature from the ACLU, and I found out I was violating their privacy unduly, (laughter) and therefore I am going to have to just give you some theories. (Laughter)

These individuals are known in the conference vernacular as "fraternal delegates," and therefore I presume it would be appropriate to begin with the representative of NIC, who, according to my Number One theory is Mr. J. Edward Murphy of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Is Mr. Murphy in the audience? (Applause)

The second one is Mr. Ralph Dudley Daniel, the President of the College Fraternity Secretarial Association.

Is Mr. Daniel here? (Applause)

Mr. Giles Zimmerman, from the International House in Philadelphia, who is representing NAFSA, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers. Mr. Zimmerman? Well that was a theory that didn't work out. (Laughter)

Mr. Ted McCarrell, Executive Director of Student Affairs at State University of Iowa, and President of AACRAO. I haven't seen Ted. He is supposed to be here. Did he make it? Theory No. 2 drew a blank.

Mr. Joseph P. Nye, from Columbia University, past president of ACUHO. Is Mr. Nye here? (Applause) I appreciate your presence particularly, Mr. Nye. I never like to draw three blanks in a row.

Dean William R. Nester, Dean of Men at the University of Cincinnati, representing the Association of College Unions. Is Dean Nester with us tonight? Bill Nester?

Now the next person whom I am going to introduce has spoiled a little fun. This is Bessie Collins, Dr. Bessie Collins, Dean of Women at Delaware, who really came here to check up on one of our past presidents. She is Vice President of NAWDC, and we very much appreciate her coming, in spite of the fact that this prevented my having some fun with Kay Toule and Pat Cross. Dr. Collins. (Applause)

Mr. Edward R. Garvey from the University of Wisconsin, who is the President of the USNSA, and representing NSA. We are being boycotted apparently. (Laughter)

Now there was one supposed to be -- (laughter and applause). There was supposed to be one other representative here, and that was from ACPA. Bill Craig did not get around to appointing a representative until quite late, so he asked me if I would do it, and I said, yes. Glen Nygreen found out about this, and gave me this assignment in order to spare you one more introduction, but I feel obliged to discharge my original responsibility to ACPA, and therefore I propose to introduce Glen Nygreen representing ACPA. (Laughter and applause)

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Thank you, Don. I have been told that Mr. Potter, also representing NSA is here. Is he here tonight? In the back. (Applause)

I had another message that one of our past presidents and wife have arrived. I wonder is Bill Guthrie and Mrs. Guthrie in the room somewhere? Will you stand up? (Applause as they arose)

We had some wonderful entertainment the other evening, you will recall, with the Temple University Choral



group, and this evening we are again going to be given the opportunity to hear some excellent music. I am happy to announce that one of the musical highlights at Drexel Institute of Technology is the R.O.T.C. Band. We have a group with us tonight. The accompanist for the group is Robert McCue; and the Director is Clyde Shive, Jr.

One group of the band's men continue their activities throughout the year, and this evening we have with us the following men: Mr. Sheldon Prager, Harry Krauss, Jr., and Charles Emely. They are all freshmen in the College of Engineering and they are going to entertain us.

We also, I understand, have a vocalist who is a senior in the Electrical Engineering school, who regularly sings with the Drexel Varsity Singers.

The group has made two European tours in the last five years and represented the city of Philadelphia at a festival in Copenhagen in 1958. Mr. Robert McCue will announce his selections.

... Musical entertainment by Mr. Robert McCue, accompanied by Clyde Shive, Jr., and the Drexel Trumpet Trio ...

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Our thanks to the gentlemen of Drexel Institute of Technology for fine presentations.

I think it would be appropriate for me at this time to introduce our officers who served us this year, and I would like to start with Carl Knox of the University of Illinois, who is serving us as Secretary-Treasurer. I would like to ask each to stand until I have introduced all of them. Mr. Knox.

Serving as Conference Chairman for the last three years -- and I think you will all agree he has done a tremendous job and I think really capped his climax this year with an outstanding and extraordinary program -- Mr. Glen Nygreen from Kent State.

Juan Reid from Colorado College, serving as Vice President, has been in charge of the Committees of the Conference.

Harold Stewart from Wayne State, serving as Vice President in charge of the Commissions.

I think these gentlemen deserve a real hand.  
(Applause)

Last, as our leader, I am sure I need not take any time to introduce President Weaver to you, but I would like to ask Fred, Secretary of the University at New York, to

please say a few words. Fred Weaver. (Applause)

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Mr. Chairman, I do take this moment to do what is really quite impossible to do in words, and that is to say the appreciation that I feel toward my associates as officers whom you have just seen standing, the members of the Executive Committee, to our Host Deans, to the Chairmen of the Committees and Commissions, to the Hotel management, to the speakers for the contribution they have made to the work of the Association during the past year.

Since it is quite impossible to say it, I thought, listening to the singer and the other musicians just a minute ago and recalling the magnificent choral performance of Monday evening, of something that might symbolize the feeling that I have.

We observed that the chorus would sing, and then there would be a special number for the soprano, and then for the contralto, and for a duet, for a tenor, and for a base, and the only thing Mr. Paige, the conductor, could do would be to extend a hand to the contralto, or to the tenor, or the base.

So if you will in your imagination see me here extending both hands, north, east, south and west, you will get the idea that I wish to convey to show that to have a program such as we have culminating this conference, requires the dedicated work of many people.

I have another sentiment in my heart. It has to do with the pleasure and the honor that it has been to me to be the president of an organization for which I have such a deep respect. Here I am helped by something else that happened in this Conference. This morning, on the recommendation of the Committee on Nominations and Place, and with the endorsement of the Executive Committee and the unanimous action of the Conference, we initiated an honorary member, the first one in twenty years, to NASPA. He is Mr. Leo Isen, seated here, taking down these words. Leo has been the Conference Reporter for this Association for twenty years. After he was so heartily welcomed into the Association he was asked if he wouldn't say a few words, and so he did. Thinking about that a little while ago I thought, "Well, I'll ask Leo if he would mind digging into his records and see if he couldn't give me a transcription of just what he said, because I think he expressed it very well." Then it occurred to me, "Well! How could he have it? He was talking." (Laughter)

I do not remember just what he said. Those of you who were there heard it, but I do know that he conveyed something which I would like to have in the record, and that is that as a man who for twenty years has been associated

with this organization, had attended virtually all of its meetings, had come to know nearly all of its members, and who every year attended some thirty professional conferences, this one stood out in his judgment as the one which possessed the most admirable, the most friendly, and to him the most commendable of all qualities that any association could have, and that, coming from Leo, I think is a very real compliment; and as far as I am concerned, Leo, them's my sentiments. I think I should ask Leo to stand so that you can see the person who formed these phrases which I think express my sentiments. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN GWIN: I know all of the members are aware of the officers who will be serving you this coming year. However, for the benefit of the visitors and wives and friends who may not be aware of these individuals, I would like to introduce the incoming officers for this year.

O. D. Roberts from Purdue will take on the herculean task for the next three years as serving as General Conference Chairman. O. D., will you stand, please?

Serving as Vice President in charge of Committees for the Association will be my good friend Vic Yanitelli from Fordham. Vic. I am privileged to be able to serve you as Vice President in charge of Commissions.

Last, our leader for this year, I would like to ask Jack Clevenger to stand. He will be serving as your leader and President, Jack Clevenger. (Applause)

As you know, one of the wonderful practices that this Association has established is that of electing Vice-Presidents- and President-Designates for the year hence. You were informed this morning that your Vice-Presidents-Designate will be Mark Smith from Denison, and Glen Nygreen from Kent State. (Applause) And serving as President-Designate, Jim McLeod from Northwestern. (Applause)

I cannot help but take this opportunity to tell a little story about Mark who, as you know, is a past master and present master at telling stories. Mark does not realize it, but he even tells jokes when he does not mean to. (Laughter)

As you will recall, last year Mark did a wonderful job of reporting on his study on Relationships with the Behavioral Sciences, and sent this huge masterpiece out to all of us. Early in the summer, Mark and Mrs. Smith had a new baby, and thinking it might be kind to call Mark and congratulate him, I called and said, "Mark, I'd like to congratulate you on your new production." Mark, thinking I had called to thank him for the work on the project, said, "Well I can't take all the credit myself. I had

several committee members who assisted me." (Laughter)

I think we have said thanks to our outgoing officers. We have wished our incoming officers well, and I now would like to call on Carl Knox, who will introduce our speaker of the evening. Carl.

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: Thank you, John.

Honored Guests and NASPA participants: Before I get to the business at hand I would just like to mention, all credit is due Carl Grip and his tremendously helpful staff, including George Letchworth who is in charge of the registration desk, and Dick Solomon of office headquarters, but Carl Grip just can't claim Marilyn Smith without a scrap. (Laughter)

The connotation of "local boy makes good" is with us this evening. After being named to All-American in football, and to the Senior Class Presidency at the University of Minnesota, our speaker served as Dean of Men at Drake University, and then returned to Minnesota as Assistant Dean of Students while completing his Ph.D.

Dr. McCreery then moved to Washington State University, where he served as Dean of Men. From this student personnel assignment, he moved to an industrial personnel position with the Aluminum Corporation of America.

The past proceedings of this Association contain his name in many places. Two entries stand out in my mind. On one occasion he persuaded a number of deans to keep diaries during their working hours, and then in a National Conference he presented a paper or a report entitled "A Dean's Day's Work, Or Why In Hell Don't He Sell Life Insurance." (Laughter)

Then it was my privilege to hear Dr. McCreery speak at Ann Arbor in 1947 during the regime of one Shorty Nowotny, when he opened his remarks with a couplet credited to Edmund, which reads:

I love to stand upon the shore and watch  
the waves in wild commotion.  
And then enjoy it all the more to sense  
that I'm not in the ocean. (Laughter)

Well, it is a genuine privilege for me to present Dr. Otis McCreery to this Forty-fourth Anniversary NASPA banquet so that he can take us all on a sentimental journey. Let us welcome this former personnel dean, who is now Assistant to the President of Alcoa, and whether you spell it m-e-t-t-l-e or m-e-t-a-l, he has proven his mettle. Dr. McCreery. (Applause)

DR. OTIS C. McCREERY (Assistant to the President, Aluminum Corporation of America): Dean Knox, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of NASPA: A white rat who had spent the day in a psychological laboratory returned to his cage and one of his compatriots said, "Well, how did things go? How did you like the laboratory?"

He said, "You won't believe this, but I've got Dean Brown so well trained that every time I push a button and turn on a red light, he gives me a piece of cheese."  
(Laughter)

In our business too the workers train the supervisors. I have called this "A Sentimental Journey," because it is a report to old friends. When I told a staff member of mine what I was doing tonight, he said, "That just confirms my suspicions. Old deans don't fade away, they just lose their faculties." (Laughter)

I intend this to be nostalgic and schmaltzy. I was thinking back to the last meeting that I attended. It was about 1933 or 1944, (laughter) and the only thing I can remember about it is a story that was told -- what did I say, 1943 or 1944. The only thing I can remember is the story that was told by Dean Neidlinger of Dartmouth at that time. The only thing that it illustrates is the vagaries perhaps of deans' positions. It is the story about during the war that the GI's in England were quite often invited out to neighboring houses.

On this particular occasion, a GI was invited, of all places, to the home of the Duchess. He put on his best uniform and went off in high spirits. He returned about three hours later, quite subdued, and they said, "Well, how did it go?"

He answered this way, "It would have been all right if the iced tea had been as cold as the soup; if the soup had been as warm as the wine; if the wine had been as old as the chicken; if the chicken had been as young as the maid; and if the maid had been as willing as the duchess."  
(Laughter)

It is astonishing how these great verities of truth stay with you over the years. (Laughter)

This meeting is held during times of great change, and great changes are taking place in every profession. A friend of mine in the medical profession, who had just returned from appraising socialized medicine in England, brought this story back. He said, one morning a young matron got out of bed and walked to the window and stretched rather languorously, and then she realized that something was the matter. She immediately called her husband, and he said, you immediately go right down to the doctor. He said,

"Perhaps you are pregnant." Then he went to his office. At the end of the day he rushed back and he said, "Well, what did he say?"

"She said, "Well, I'm pregnant all right."

"Well, what happened?"

She said, "Well you know socialized medicine, the doctors have so many patients they can only spend a little while with each one, and they have to automate everything."

"What did he do?"

"Well, he examined me."

"Is that all he did?"

"Well he did do this. Before I got dressed he took a rubber stamp and stamped on my abdomen."

He said, "You mean letters?"

She said, "Yes. I can't read it; it's upside down." So she opened her blouse and he leaned over and he couldn't read it either. So he went over and got a reading glass and leaned over and read it, and here were these words: "When these letters are large enough so that you don't have to read it with a reading glass, take your wife to the hospital. (Laughter)"

As Carl said, in the spring of 1944 in the Washington State campus we had about 2,000 Air Corps men. I was the director of that program. I think it was a good program, but as you remember, a month later every training program in the country was over. There were fifteen men left on the Washington State campus, and I decided I could not stay there for two years making plans until the GI's came back.

I went to the president and I said, "I would like to get a leave of absence and get some experience in industrial personnel work." And he couldn't see it. I still thought it was a good idea, so I resigned. I will never have such courage again. I wrote to some of my friends, and in July of that year I was personnel manager of the Los Angeles plant of Alcoa.

I had hardly ever been in an industrial plant before. The whole jargon was strange to me, instruments and forgings and castings, and so forth. My two predecessors, the first one had had a nervous breakdown, and the second one had died of a heart attack. And this was a very tough union and I do not think they expected a great deal of longevity from me, but I survived.

You know, my friends have asked me, how about this transition? Was it pretty tough? And I must admit that it was tough. During those early months I woke up nights sometimes and said, "What am I doing here? I'm not on a college campus. What's the meaning of all of this?" Then I realized there were more things in common than there were different about it.

In fact, in those days of war activities, there was a great deal of similarity with school activities. For football rally, we had war bond sales. For water fights and panty raids, we had wildcat strikes. For high school visitation, we had "wartime recruiting." For Freshmen Week we had employee orientation. For discipline, we had discipline. (Laughter)

You know, it is a popular fancy that people on educational campuses are wildeyed idealists off in Cloud 9, and everyone in industry are very tough and practical money grubbers. I have not found that to be the case.

I have known a lot of people in education who are practical, good business men, many of them doing wonderful jobs of administration with an insufficient budget.

On the other hand, it may surprise you to have me say that I found a great deal of idealism in industry and business.

You have geniuses in both cases; you have screwballs in each case. We have a metallurgist, for example. If he were dropped among a group of absent-minded professors on the college campus, he would stand out because he would be more absent-minded than they would. He came home a couple of months ago, and much to his surprise he found the lights were all on. He came in and found flowers around various places. They had the best silver on the table, and gifts. He said, "Mary, what's all this? Here you have the best silver, and our new napkins, and flowers."

"Why, John," she said, "don't you remember? This is your wedding anniversary."

"Oh," he said, "Oh, so it is; and, Mary, if you'll tell me when yours comes, I'll want to do the same for you." (Laughter)

I would like to talk a little bit tonight about some of the tools that have served you and served me in industry. Those that interest me particularly are those of selection and training.

Six weeks ago today the greatest selection program in the history of the country perhaps was climaxed when Colonel Glenn orbited the earth. We have to go back

to the time of Charles Lindbergh to find a personality who has so captured the imagination and the affections of the people. Even the newspaper columnists got dewey-eyed when they talked about John Glenn.

Yesterday President Montgomery -- I think his dean is here some place -- from Muskingum College was in my office. I said to him, "How do you account for a man like this?"

He very quickly said, "This is a part of our long range program. We are just turning out from this liberal arts college just what we intended to." That was his explanation. (Laughter)

I said, "Is this man over-rated?"

He said, "His classmates say, if anything, he is under-rated." This is hard for me to believe.

What formula do you imagine produced this chap? Well, perhaps something like this: heredity, environment, development, selection, training, and opportunity.

I am indebted to my friend Dr. Baer, a Pittsburgh psychologist, who assisted in this program, and he has given me a copy of the official report. It is not classified, and I would like to tell you some of the things that are in that report.

They started out with this selection program of surveying the records of all of the pilots in NASA. There were 508 test pilots that they picked from this group. This means that already a selection program had taken place because perhaps one out of fifty pilots have the qualities, mental and physical, to become a test pilot.

Of this 508, 110 satisfied the basic criteria of the Air Research Development Command of NASA. These were those criteria:

Besides successfully graduating from the test pilot school, they had to be medically acceptable and technically capable. They must have received an engineering degree, or its equivalent. They must have achieved 15 hours of flying time, and could be no taller than 5'11".

Of the 110, 69 of these men were asked to volunteer as competitive candidates for Project Mercury; 55 accepted. They were intensively interviewed and given a long battery of psychological tests. Thirty-two were chosen to go through the final phase of selection at Lovelace Foundation, Albuquerque, New Mexico. Something happened to one of these men -- I do not know what -- because they talk about only the 31 that remained. Here at Lovelace there were the



most severe types of interviews, physical examinations, biochemical and psychological tests were given. These tests, I think, deserve special notice.

In 1952 Captain T. F. Maguire started development of these tests which eventually might be used for this selection. They were to simulate stresses which the pilot would encounter in flight, and test the adequacy of the pilot in adjusting to and controlling strange situations. May I quote from their Manual:

"Psychological and physical stresses will exist before, during and after each flight. The psychological stresses will include fears and anxiety about possible accidents or death. Although well digested in the mature test pilot, they will be present. The psychiatric evaluation should reveal those who are stable and reliable.

"The physical stresses of blast-off and orbit will include acceleration, noise, vibration, weightlessness, tumbling if stabilization is not achieved, and possible capsule depressurization; those insults of re-entry" -- that is their language, not mine -- "will contain deceleration, noise, vibration and heat, if the cooling system fails.

"Landing will be accompanied by extreme deceleration. Before recovery, there is the possibility that the capsule will sink. There is also the possibility of isolation in a remote and uninhabitable climate and topography."

Very encouraging, these people.

There were six of these physiological, biochemical tests. The first was a pressure suit test. After dressing in a tight fitting garment designed to apply pressure to the body during high altitude flight, each candidate entered a chamber simulating an altitude of 65,000 feet. This produces severe physical discomfort and confinement, and eventually blackout.

Isolation -- each man was confined to a dark, soundproofed room for 34 hours.

This procedure aids in identifying subjects who cannot tolerate forced inactivity, enclosure in small spaces or absence of external stimuli.

Are you ready to sign up?

The next is called completion behavioral simulator. The candidate was required to make different responses to each of 14 signals which appeared in random order at increasing rates of speed. Since the test produces a maximum of confusion and frustration, it measures the ability to organize behavior and to maintain emotional

equilibrium under stress.

Think this should prepare you for Freshman Week, perhaps?

Acceleration -- the candidates are placed on the human centrifuge and subjected to the differing forces. Noise and vibration is about what you would expect it to be.

The last was heat. Each candidate spent two hours in a chamber maintained at 130°F. Once again, this is an uncomfortable experience, during which efficiency might be impaired. That is an understatement of the week, I would think.

From these tests, in addition to a complete battery of eighteen psychological tests, starting with Rorschach and ending with an essay "Who Am I?", a final choice was made by a selection committee.

Of the thirty-one, eight were not recommended, seven got the rating of outstanding without reservations; three were considered outstanding with reservations. These reservations were: One candidate was not entirely sure he wanted to continue. That I can understand. (Laughter)

One candidate had a very high index of strain as a result of his -- one candidate had a heart murmur of possible organic etiology. I do not believe this was Slayten because he was one of the seven. One candidate had a high index of strain as a result of his performance in the heat test. The remaining thirteen were highly recommended.

As we all know, from these seven, Shepard and Grissom were selected for the suborbital flights, and on February 20, 1962, Colonel John Glenn orbited the earth and made a successful re-entry.

How about the qualities of this man? Certainly as far as flying skills are concerned, he administered successfully every task that he was asked to take. His poise took him through that period of wait and those tremendous delays. They failed to discourage him or blunt his motivation. But it seems to me perhaps the most outstanding quality as far as I could see was the humility after he was successful, with which he faced and met the adulation of the crowd and his patience with the press who it almost seems were trying to wring the last bit of sensationalism from his close family relationships. All of these, I would think mark him as a superior person.

It seems to me there are certain lessons that we might find as a result of this selection procedure.

One is, how many of these men would have been

discovered if it had not been for this opportunity? How many John Glens are there with a potentiality to become a personality, of the same caliber as Dr. Jonas Salk or George Romney, or, to give equal time, John F. Kennedy? (Laughter) How many of these people are lying undiscovered, except for this opportunity?

Perhaps we should more carefully appraise our young associates who are around us. Dr. Baer tells me that he was tremendously impressed with the complete involvement of these men. It is almost a monastic dedication to a way of life.

I have wondered, can this involvement be transferred to democracy? The Russians say that they will bury us because we really do not believe in democracy, or in Christianity, or in our way of life, as does the dedicated young communist believe in his. It is something to think about.

Another lesson, it seems to me, is that given the proper selection, training to his capacity to accept it, and full preparation, the man is tougher than the machine. It is a triumph of the human spirit. When the automatic controls went awry and John Glen found that he could operate the capsule manually, he could not help but say, "Man is back in control."

Man was able to sweat out the delays, while the machine was constantly undergoing repair and readjustment.

Most of these tests were simulating tests, developed to anticipate the stresses of the flight to come. In fact, in the pilot's report after the flight, they said that the tests were so severe that the stresses of weightlessness, acceleration, tumbling and disorientation, as experienced in the actual flight seemed minor discomforts compared to the hardships of the test.

I wonder if this has some lessons for education and industry both, in preparing a young man for the stressful experiences of adult life. Can education, while the student is in a familiar, beneficent environment, help him anticipate some of the stresses so that when he later experiences discouragement and failure, it will not be so devastating? Can there be tests or experiences which will reveal to him his weaknesses before he faces such crises as the wrong job, the wrong company, the wrong wife? I do not know.

It was the conclusion of the final selection committee that the scores in the physiological tests were of secondary importance in the selection. In fact it would be difficult to divide the astronauts from the other NASA pilots on the basis of physiological tests.

Of primary importance were the results of the psychological tests, but especially the psychological reactions to the physical tests, fear, insufficient motivation, claustrophobia.

I believe we can gain greater insight into young people we counsel with more refined tools in this field. They may help finally to forecast the "will do" as well as the "can do."

To me it is a real lesson to have it confirmed again that so many times humility comes from strength. Then, without getting maudlin, is it bad to have a new image for teenagers and adults, embodying strength, humility, intellectual alertness, physical fitness, and dedication to finish a task, supported by a faith in God which places our paltry activities in proper perspective?

These, to me, were all important lessons and could be helpful to both education and industry.

I cannot help but talk to you a little bit about these two great factors, because they have meant so much in my life. In two years I will have spent as long in industry as I did in education. One of my responsibilities happens to be Chairman of the Contributions Committee for Alcoa. It gives me the opportunity to keep in touch with education. And I am more convinced every day how important it is to work back and forth across this line of industry and education, and how much each needs the other, and how much they can do together.

It seems to me that education and industry are really like two legs or two laps of a great relay race. Education comes storming down the course and passes the baton to industry, who then finishes the journey. Poor preparation will ruin the race; a poor finish will ruin the race. But a good start, a smooth transition, and a good finish will produce a new record perhaps.

One thing it seems to me we should remember, and that is that it is not the man, it is not the one who gives off, or the one who receives the baton that is most important. It is the baton.

I think this can be a great partnership in developing men. You give us your finished product, and it becomes our raw material. Together we can make something good out of it.

But I would have to admit in coming back to you and making this report, that if business is going to do its job in this partnership, I have some things to confess about it. Business has a good many problems to solve. One is the question of size. Many people say that businesses are

too big. A couple of years ago we bought a small company, and we found out that we had nothing to tell that company. The president of this company was a man of real leadership. Because he was only two echelons away from his workers, or his salesmen, he could watch the cost control and customer satisfaction, and the development of his personnel. We decided the best thing for us was to keep our hands off of it. So decentralization many times has its advantages.

But in great national emergencies it seems that the government finds it necessary to hand over to big, national companies great blocks of responsibility, companies that can control raw materials, manufacturing, and distribution. So whether we are big or whether we are small, there is a reason for it, and I judge that educational institutions have some of the same problems. I imagine I could get a good argument here between whether it is a good thing to be big or small in education.

The international problem is another one. Alcoa used to call itself and think of itself as a domestic company, but today it has plants in South America, Mexico, Australia, Japan, England, and the Caribbean. "Ugly Americans" must not represent us in these important countries.

I think that industry can contribute a great deal to our foreign relationships. I read the other day where Sebastian Hefner, a correspondent in England, explaining the American foreign relations philosophy, said it is very simple, "you are friendly to the neutrals, you are neutral to your enemies, and you are hostile to your friends." (laughter) "That's your philosophy."

I am very happy that down in Surinam -- we used to call it Dutch Guiana -- in South America where all our bauxite comes from, that this spring for the first time we are appointing the first native general manager. That comes close to being a billion dollar operation. This man came up through the school system in Surinam. He has been trained and educated in the best technical schools in Holland. He is equipped intellectually, technically and in personality to do this job.

Incidentally, down there right now we are building a huge dam to generate electricity for a big smelter. This is being done on the Surinam River, right through the jungle. Today there are men operating bulldozers, who two years ago came out of the bush and the most complex tool that they had ever used was the ax. In two years they are covering 200 years from the Stone Age to the Twentieth Century.

Relations with foreign countries, of course, bring other problems. One is foreign competition. In

1946 Japan and Germany were defeated and exhausted. Today they are almost completely recovered, because of the help through the Marshall Plan and other help that was given them. After World War II European managers visited the United States and they were shown and trained in techniques and methods, in equipment, and manager know-how -- everything that Yankee ingenuity had used to out-pace the world in productivity. We almost did too well, because today Belgium can deliver glass in Detroit cheaper than Pittsburgh Plate can. Germany can lay wire on the New York docks cheaper than Bethlehem Steel. Japan can deliver steel sheet to construction in Los Angeles cheaper than U. S. Steel.

And the reasons are these: First, because of their individual energy and aggressive productivity. There is no question about it. Second, because of the tremendous difference in labor rates. Finally, the third reason is that when their factories were lying in rubble, they got the funds and help, and they bought the best equipment, highly automated, technically superb. In many of their mills they have presses and furnaces which are three to five years ahead of our own.

We are happy that the European countries, our allies, have risen above their national prejudices and formed the Common Market, an association which has all the virtues of interstate commerce of the United States. We are happy because they make for us a powerful ally, almost invincible. But let us face it, it means we must compete with our friends as well as our enemies.

Another problem is business ethics. A friend of mine says that more has been written on this subject than is known. (Laughter) And I imagine that that is true. But there is enough to kind of shake business up and force it to take a look at this thing.

But in passing, may I say that it does not behoove any other profession to be overly critical. I do not want to ask you how many athletes come into your schools on the same standards of admission that your other students do; or about some that attract the type of man who then is found shaving points in basketball; or how many of your varsity athletes have gone on to graduate after their participation was completed. I will not ask you those questions. But the great majority of business men, as are the great majority of educators, are honest.

What I think I am trying to say is that there is a world to build out there, and it will be a better world if education and industry can do it together.

These last remarks I should like to direct to those men who are wearing the Green Ribbons, to all those young men who may be Assistant Deans, or interneers, or

advisers who are just coming into the profession. It is a glorious profession. Three hundred years ago John Donne wrote a paragraph which starts, "No man is an island."

From this, Ernest Hemingway chose the title of his great book, "For Whom the Bell Tolls." It was the thesis of this book that death comes to everyone, the bell tolls for every one.

I would like to paraphrase that and say the bell rings many times. It rings at high moments in your life. These high moments are times when you pull all of your resources together and make impact upon some problem.

I came out to Washington State in 1937 as a result of a student strike. It was a revolt against outmoded social rules, and the students had a great deal of support from the faculty. But the rift between the administration and the student body was severe. I did not know that. I came as a very innocent person into that situation.

I was sitting in my office a few days before school started, and I looked up and here was a blond giant of a man standing there, about six foot three, weighing 225 pounds, and he said, "My name is Chris Rumberg. I am president of the student body. Are you the new dean?"

I said, "Yes."

He said, "I wonder if I could talk to you?" So he came in and we talked for about two or three hours. I told you that he was president of the student body, I think. He said, "You know, this is amazing, but you evidently want the same things for this student body as I want for it."

I said, "I hope so, Chris." He was captain of the football team, he was president of his fraternity, but he was elected president of the student body by the independents. And he had many of the qualities which I think John Glenn must have.

We had a wonderful year that year. I hope I was helpful to him. I know he was helpful to me. And he went on to graduate.

Chris's high moment came in 1944 when, as Major Chris Rumberg, he was crossing the North Atlantic with his troops, the ship was torpedoed, he gave his life belt to an 18-year old, and went down with his ship.

I am not suggesting that I had any influence on that act. His pattern was set long before I came along. But I am sure of this, that he was influenced by his counselors, both at home and at school.

To these young men here, I should like to say, your high moment will come. It will be at a time when you can pull all of your resources together and make its influence felt. Maybe it will not be as dramatic as this one, nor as fatal, we would hope. Maybe it will be research in the social sciences, maybe it will be a tremendous job of administration, but many times it will be making your influence felt on young men.

Two things I would suggest: First that you prepare for this big moment; and second -- which may be more difficult -- that you recognize it when it comes. And as John Donne ended his message, so I would like to end mine: "Do not send then to find for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Thank you, Dr. McCreery, for a delightfully interesting and informative speech. I am sure that your duties as a dean and your work with young people have stood you in good stead in your position of leadership in industry. We are happy to have one of us there.

I would like to say that there has been absolutely no collusion between myself and Dr. McCreery in what I am going to say now, but I think you might find it interesting.

Most of you do not know that I was born in Philadelphia just about twelve blocks from here. On Sundays, as a boy, I went to St. Peters Church, one of the oldest -- in fact the second oldest Episcopal church in the country, which is just down the street a ways. Not wishing to sing in the choir, as all good Welchmen do, I rang the church chimes. This was a wonderful experience, about seven stories high. We had a full octave ring, and you had to pull the ropes of the bells, which were probably another seven stories higher.

I had a wonderful experience Sunday when I came here of going back to the church, where the chimes had not been rung for quite awhile, and climbed up to the steeple and rang them again. It was an exhilarating experience, I can assure you.

Tonight I should like to dedicate my ringing of the bells to Fred Weaver as outgoing President, and to Jack Clevenger as the new, ringing out the old and ringing in the new.

Unfortunately, Fred is going to do other duties in his important educational service, where his talents and abilities are needed. I should like to say that I pride myself on being able to see greatness in a man. With Fred, of course, this takes no special talent, for anyone who has sat in the warmth of his presence, listened to the wisdom of his words, sensed his true humility and tremendous



stature, has known greatness. Although Mrs. Weaver has been the primary object of Fred's love and affection, we have all been fortunate enough to share as recipients of his real affection and leadership. It will be hard to lose him even temporarily to his new duties.

I sound as though I am burying the president.  
(Laughter) If I am, I do it in the sense of an epitaph a farmer dictated to his friends: "I loved my two wives, Emma and Tillie. When you bury me, please tilt me toward Tillie." (Laughter)

In your new duties, Fred, I hope you will tilt towards NASPA, for I know that your new job is a difficult one and does have some lessons of being buried within it.

I would like now to ask President Weaver to come to the rostrum and pass the gavel to our new President, Jack Clevenger.

PRESIDENT WEAVER: Will Jack Clevenger please step forward.

Jack, among the many great guys in this outfit, there is one little fellow with a great spirit who, when he writes you a letter, says, "Keep wonderful." That is Vic Yanitelli, more reverently known as Father Yanitelli. With apologies to him I say, as I give you this gavel, "Keep NASPA wonderful."

... Applause as the gavel was presented to President Clevenger and he assumed the Chair ...

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you very much, Fred.

I trust that all of you understand the depth of feeling that I express when I say that this gavel, and the office it represents, means truly a very great deal to me, because to me it signifies a token of acceptance, and a token of confidence from some wonderful men, colleagues, friends, for whom I hold the very highest esteem.

I have now spent ten years in NASPA since my first meeting in Colorado Springs, back in 1952. It has been my privilege, as it has been yours, to get to know so many fine men, so many great men in this organization, and thus to become a president of this group, to stand alongside these men, is an honor for anyone, and one which I hope I can accept with a deep sense of humility and a very genuine commitment to responsibility.

In saying this, incidentally, I speak not only for myself, but for John, and for Vic, for the members of the Executive Committee, and for all the others of you who accept

responsibility in this fine organization.

I understand by tradition I have observed that the new president has three functions to perform at this annual banquet. The first and the most pleasant one is to express again, to reiterate again for all of us, to say to you, Fred, how much we appreciate your superb leadership.

Now, you are a perceptive man and I am sure you understand, in part at least, the respect and the affection that we hold for you. Your leadership has inspired us, this organization, and all of its members are better for it. We are deeply grateful to you, Fred, and we hope you will always look upon these experiences in NASPA as one of the high marks in your very productive career as one of the country's outstanding educators.

My second act, and also a very pleasant one, is to announce to you the members of the executive committee for the coming year. I would like all of these men to stand and remain standing so that you can see them as a team; and when I have introduced them, to give them your applause because there is much hard work ahead for this group:

Vic Yanitelli, Vice President, from Fordham  
John Gwin, Vice President, from Beloit  
Carl Knox, our Secretary-Treasurer, from Illinois  
O. D. Roberts, our Program Chairman, from Purdue  
Fred Turner, our Historian, from Illinois  
Fred Weaver, Past President, from North Carolina  
Jim McLeod, our President-Designate, from  
Northwestern  
Glen Nygreen, our Vice-President-Designate, from  
Kent State  
Mark Smith, our Vice-President-Designate, from  
Denison

Then the following new men -- these men are all here by position, as officers in the Association, and then these new men whom I am especially happy to present:

John Blackburn, University of Alabama  
Tom Broadbent, from the Riverside campus, University of California  
K. Wm. (Bill) Cheney, from Springfield College  
Tom Emmet, from the University of Detroit  
Howard Hoogesteger, from Lake Forest  
Ben Perry, from Florida A & M (Ben had to leave today. He spent two days with us.)  
Phil Price from New York University, and Phil had to leave this afternoon.

This is our Executive Committee for the coming year. (Applause)

Now, this group, together with the old members of the Executive Committee, I ask to meet in fifteen minutes from now in the Lafayette Room.

My third act as President is to declare this meeting adjourned. Thank you all very much. (Applause)

... The Conference Banquet Session recessed at ten o'clock ...

---

### THIRD BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

The Third Business Session convened at nine-five a.m., President Clevenger presiding.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: It is five minutes later than we promised to open this concluding business session. We have fifty-five minutes to conclude our Conference business this morning.

I call first on John Netherton, the Chairman of our Committee on International Exchange of Students, for an additional report from his committee. John.

DEAN NETHERTON (Committee on International Exchange of Students): Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: We are busy, and it is late. I will nevertheless ask for the indulgence of a few seconds to get something off my chest. It is kind of a 24-hour double-take on something Juan Reid said yesterday morning. He alluded to my departure from the Association, and happened to use the word "desertion."

I found myself taking exception to the use of this word. I was reminded, by a fraction of a second too late yesterday morning, of something that I think is perhaps apropos. I was reminded of another occasion when a name was applied to something that I proposed to do. When I was 14 years old another kid named Junior Shaffer and I sneaked over to U. S. 30, then called Lincoln Highway, and hitchhiked to the west coast.

There had been kind of a rash of runaways in our town that year, and I was a little concerned. We might recognize that now as "preoccupation with the public image." So I left a note with my mother: "Dear Mother, I am not running away. I am merely taking a vacation. Therefore, will you please, while I am gone, feed my rabbits and my white mice."

Well it suggests a kind of exit line for me from this Association. "Dear Association, once a dean, always a dean. I am not running away. And, Fellows, I know that while I am gone I can count on you to take care of the little beasts." (Laughter)

Your Committee on International Exchange of Students is now ready to bring before you, to seek your approval of the recommendation that was included in our report of yesterday. The inappropriateness of our asking you yesterday to approve this before we had an opportunity to discuss it with Commission I, part of whose affair it is, no longer exists because we discussed it yesterday with Commission I, and the sense of the meeting was that Commission I sees no objection.

I will read the recommendation in a minute. It is printed and on the table back there, but some of you may not have it. It came out in our discussion of this with Commission I -- first, let me read it right now:

"We recommend that the President, in consultation with the chairmen of Commission I and the Committee on International Exchange of Students, be in communication with the President of N.A.F.S.A., if possible in advance of N.A.F.S.A.'s annual meeting in late April, with a view to arranging the appointment of a joint working Committee of representatives of the two associations, charged as follows:

"1. To analyze the relationship between N.A.S.P.A. and N.A.F.S.A. and recommend standing procedures for co-operation in furtherance of objectives common to both associations; and

"2. To meet periodically between this Spring and the time of next year's association meetings to exchange views and prepare any appropriate reports or recommendations as to the interests of the two associations in relation to new federal or other major programs in international education (the reasonable expenses for meetings to be borne jointly by the two associations upon approval of the executive bodies.)"

It came out in our discussion of this with Commission I yesterday that if you endorse (if that is the word) this recommendation, when it comes to the president and the executive committee, the language of this would leave to them the option in their wisdom to do either what this superficially seems to say, namely, appoint yet a new committee, ad hoc for this particular purpose of negotiating with NAFSA, or to consider that it was appropriate to name either the entire committee on International Exchange of Students, the standing committee, or a sub-committee of that committee to be the committee referred to in this recommendation. That is up to the president and the

executive committee to decide, as we see it.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of this recommendation of the Committee on International Exchange.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thanks, John.

DEAN ANDERSON: Second the motion.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: What do you wish to do with this recommendation? Any discussion?

... The question was called ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The question is called for. All those in favor please say, "aye." Opposed. It is so ordered.

I now ask Jack Gwin, as Vice President in Charge of Commissions, to take the rostrum to present the remaining three Commission reports.

Before you get up here, Jack, I want to express to you my own personal appreciation, and the appreciation of all of us for the fine program that you presented last night and the fine job you did stepping into the breach there, sir, to serve as the Master of Ceremonies at our Annual Conference Banquet. You did a fine job, and we all appreciate it, and I wanted you to know our feelings about that, Jack.

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: Thank you, Jack. It was a pleasure and I was happy to be able to do it.

Our first Commission report this morning will be from Commission VII on Religious Activities. Joe Gluck is Chairman of that Commission, and had no report the other day but was waiting until the meeting we had the evening before last and I think, Joe, you are ready to report at this time.

DIRECTOR GLUCK (Commission VII, Religious Activities): As most of you know, we had a panel around the subject of religious activities the other evening, so this report was delayed until we had had a session after the seminar, to get the report out that we have here.

During the past year, your Chairman has been working with two national organizations that I think most of you know about, who work in this particular field of religious activities. These organizations are (1) The National Association of College and University Chaplains, which we know as NACUC; and the other organization is known as ACURA, or the Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs.

Your chairman participated in the annual conference of ACURA, which was held in Kansas City last November, and this month we will be in a meeting with NACUC, at Moravia College.

Together, the Commission feels that these two organizations offer methods of cooperation on campus religious work which will fit all kinds of local groups. The NASPA members are encouraged to learn more about the work of both of these groups.

The Commission has a primary interest in discovering the authentic developments, both in philosophy and program of campus religious expressions, as reflected in the work of NACUC, ACURA, and also the various church related programs of the major faiths.

We feel there is a growing awareness among all campus religious groups for the need: (1) to understand each other, (2) to respect each other, and (3) for more cooperation in many new areas of campus religious work.

There is also an evidence, we believe, of a growing body of understanding which is shared by the religious groups and student personnel workers, regarding this very critical matter in the field of (1) freedom, and (2) cooperation, these being two sides of the same coin.

Commission VII finally proposes to continue a work which we believe this Association has already had under way for more mutual understanding among student personnel workers and the campus religious workers.

NASPA members are invited to encourage cooperative, religious organizations and activities on their own campuses, wherever the climate for this kind of cooperation seems to be favorable.

Finally, we feel that the personnel deans are, in most situations, actually the key people on campus to facilitate this kind of favorable climate.

I move this report be accepted.

DEAN REID: I second the motion.

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: You have heard the motion. It has been seconded. Are there any questions, or discussion on this report? Call for the question. All those in favor of accepting this report please say, "aye." Opposed. It is carried.

Is Carl Grip here?

We will now move to Commission V, Relationships

with the Behavioral Sciences, and I will ask Mark Smith if he will come forward please and give his report.

DEAN SMITH (Commission V, Relationships with the Behavioral Sciences): I am too tired to be funny this morning, so I will simply give the report.

I am not going to read this report. It has been duplicated for the membership. I will paraphrase some of it, and then I want to get to John Alexander's paper.

It is true that we have had a great variety of responses to the questionnaire study report, which was presented at Colorado Springs. When I say that most of them have been positive responses, it is probably better to say that most of them have been responses to which I have reacted positively.

This paper that John is going to give is a brief paper, but it represents, I think, something very important in the development of Commission V and of its work. Commission V has been, in some ways, kind of a bad boy from time to time. At least it has tried to be. Now I think there has to come a time when this Commission turns to a picture of the context in which the student personnel administrator works, and of the context in which he can, or should have relationship with the behavioral sciences, teaching behavioral sciences on his campus, and I think, John, in reviewing the responses to question 4 of the questionnaire, which asked our friends on behavioral science faculties why they thought we were ineffective in various areas of responsibility, I think in his review of these responses, he is beginning to get at the kind of perspective that this Commission now needs.

So I would like to have him give this paper, and then I will return to move on with the report. John Alexander.

DEAN ALEXANDER (Commission V): This is "An Analysis of the Responses Following Question Four, concerning Judgments of Ineffectiveness of Student Personnel Workers."

I. The separation of student facilities from academic pursuits

The critical views of student personnel workers expressed by respondents to the questionnaire, in the comments following question four, reveal a paradox. While academic persons were in the first place those who separated jurisdiction over student life from teachers, they now deplore what they view as the anti-intellectual character of much student personnel work. Still supporting a system that "gets students off their hands," they disparage the results.

At earlier points of decision there might have developed some alternative arrangements which would have left students under the more pervasive jurisdiction of essentially academic authorities. By now, most of our larger institutions are irrevocably committed to a separated and centralized complex known as the student personnel system. We do know, however, that the two oldest English Universities have a markedly different character. There the teaching and student life functions have been kept coherently together so that large numbers of students are dispersed among relatively autonomous and viable units of moderate size. There are no university level authorities concerned significantly with student functions. Nearly everyone who deals directly with students is an academic person in a college.

We, on the other hand, have now in our larger universities a highly differentiated and complex system of what we identify as student personnel services -- separated from academic jurisdiction in most instances. This separation has profoundly affected the nature of these services and the attitudes of faculty and students to them. It has also affected academic life itself.

The separation has tended to isolate the academic experience as something that takes place only in the class room or in obvious and direct preparation for it. Courses, daily classes, course examinations, term papers, text books and course grades tend to be the focus of any intellectual attention rather than concern for a developing and pervasive intellectual experience and consciousness.

## II. Ineffectiveness of Student Personnel Workers in Functions Thought to Belong More Properly to the Academic Area

If faculties eschew responsibility for student life and leave concern for it to a specially recruited and separately trained staff of personnel workers there will be inevitable tensions between the two areas of teaching and student work. Most of the academic ineffectiveness of student personnel workers, which those answering the questionnaire believe to prevail, emanates from this tension.

We find less of this tension in smaller colleges or faculties, where those concerned with student functions are to have been teachers and where their span of authority is within the limits of a single college or faculty. Here the staff member specially concerned with students is more generally viewed as a colleague by the teacher. Our experience tells us this and the questionnaire replies indicate it as well.

A sense of the dilemma is evident in many responses, which reject deans of student staff from academic areas, while criticizing them for being anti-intellectual.



To segregate student functions and administrators, outside of faculties and in a specialized bureaucracy, these teachers imply, is to make the resulting system inevitably non-academic and frequently anti-intellectual. The following comments are to be noted.

"... student personnel officers conceive of their position as independent and distinct from the faculty ... they become the agents for the students in hobbling or harrassing the faculty."

"... Some personnel people are an anti-intellectual influence, others ... reduce the force of standards."

"... the student personnel administrator setting up his program as a competitor to other segments of the academic system."

"These factors (academic motivation and performance) should be the responsibility of the ... faculty. Student personnel administrators cannot do the job no matter how sincere ... The fact that you have been listing these academic concerns as possible areas of responsibility for student personnel administrators indicates to me one of the major faults of the university system."

"... There is a wall of separation between personnel officers and the major concern of the institution, namely, effective scholarship. ... but I can't suggest how to work this out."

Some ways for working this out must be found. It is clear, given the historic example of the English Universities, that to avoid bigness of individual educational units is one way. Where bigness exists, or where its growth cannot be avoided, ways to mitigate its hazards must be sought.

The staffs of deans of students must be selected whenever possible from among those who have had teaching experience. When it is feasible, they should be given some continuing contact with an academic discipline and a class room. Certainly no smaller college, or newly large university, should mimic as virtue that which was taken on by older, large institutions, mistakenly or otherwise, as necessity.

Deans of students should be trained in behavioral sciences so they may better understand the complex social system and personality factors with which they are concerned. They must understand the institutional structure within which they are to operate as well as achieve personal intellectual respectability.

When the separation is accepted as a fact of life the questionnaire respondents seem to ask that the then designated student personnel worker be endowed with acceptable qualities of intellect and outlook rather than just have experience with the apparatus and facilities of student life. This can go far toward closing the gap.

Other institutional practices can mitigate the effects of this unfortunate division of labor between teachers and deans of students and their staffs. They can be affiliated with particular faculties in several ways. Service on committees with academic concerns may be one way. Also, teachers can be involved in the much maligned non-academic area. They thus may be able to curtail some of the excesses they rightfully criticize.

Finally, where the intellectual spheres of a campus are integrated, and where a spirit of liberal inquiry prevails, the staff of the dean of students will more likely be brought into and hence reflect the tone of the intellectual establishment. Where separatism and narrow professionalization prevails among the faculties, the functions of the dean of students will be more sharply relegated to a non-academic existence.

### III. Comments on the ineffectiveness of the dean of students' staff in areas judged appropriate to its jurisdiction

There is still another aspect of the division evidenced in the responses by social science teachers to the questionnaire. When the staff of the dean of students is separated from the faculty it is subjected more openly to the counter force of the prevailing "youth culture" which students bring to the campus. The student activity, or residence worker, frequently has to resist its counter-intellectual pressures without faculty assistance. He is often charged with "joining" it because he cannot "lick" it. That they do "join" it is claimed by many respondents to the questionnaire, as evidenced in the following comments:

"... student personnel administration fails to emphasize scholarship, cultural growth, and intellectual development because excessive importance is placed upon extracurricular activities, 'togetherness' and a kind of materialistic Dale Carnegie type of human relations."

"... I have yet to hear a personnel person speak with pride of the academic records of students, but I have heard many of them brag about their May Days, bicycle races, courts, councils, dormitory organizations, and interfraternity achievements."

"... surrender to youth culture ...be popular with students."

"... emphasis appears to be on athletics and entertainment."

"... over attentive to ... doing what students may want..."

In apparent opposition to the above position a significant number of respondents viewed the student worker as ineffective because he was too cautious and too concerned with bending students to conformity with institutional norms. The following phrases from the questionnaire responses express this view:

"... don't disturb the status quo unless necessary."

"... the well run campus for public relations reasons."

"... control, conformity, mediocrity, and confusion are clearly the results."

"... generally regarded by the faculty as the ally of the administration, hence perceived as 'the enemy'." (Laughter)

"... his messages are often interpreted as 'bothersome orders' by both students and faculty alike."

"... a general philosophy of treating students as immature, ignorant and subordinate individuals."

"... either rigid rule enforcers or excessively permissive, indiscriminating, 'I want to be liked' personalities."

If the program in the non-academic area is to be anything more than an uninspired reflection of the prevailing youth culture the student activity worker leading it must have some academic sense and impulse. He must have academic orientation and a sense of the nature of intellectual maturation, if he is to avoid the administrative police force extreme.

The problem is to assure that staff workers in the activity and residence areas are educators, not wardens or social directors.

#### IV. Ineffectiveness in professional and technical areas: personal counselling, health service and research

The alleged ineffectiveness in these areas, stated in a few responses, suggested that the dean's staff worker may on occasion assume more responsibility than his

training warrants. Such objections were expressed in regard to all kinds of counselling, from academic to therapeutic. In regard to research in the area of his own operation and jurisdiction, stated criticisms were that deans of students and their staffs are either too busy or ill trained.

It would help close the various gaps pointed out above if deans of students were equipped to do research on the effectiveness of what they are doing. Something more than statistical accounting is needed. Appropriate research could help clarify educational goals to which efforts of deans of students are directed, as well as to assess their realization. While deans and their staffs are heavily burdened, teachers are also so busy that they have trouble getting research done. The method of relief for the latter, sabbatical and research leaves, might fruitfully be used even for deans.

#### V. To summarize

In view of the cross pressures and fissures which beset his area of work the dean of students needs very special personal qualities and training if he is to survive and make any real educational contribution. The conclusions of this analysis are not to condemn him but to clarify the hazards of his job. Apart from whatever qualities he has himself, his job is inherently more difficult in a large multi-faculty university with central student personnel services. Some of the things he needs, including institutional arrangements, have been suggested in earlier sections.

He must be able to find the student where he is, intellectually and culturally, and help bring him around to realizing and achieving the academic expectations of the institution. A teacher must of course do the same thing, but his task in this regard is less difficult since his role is clearer. He does meet with the student over subject matter.

The dean of students must by all means understand how intellectual and social maturation takes place and must make his contribution to providing optimum conditions for this to occur in the students under his jurisdiction. This is also a concern of the teacher.

The dean's staff members, however, encounter the student more broadly than does the teacher. In some of the areas in which he is encountered there are strong forces resisting what all wish to see achieved. Here is where the student worker may really test his mettle. It is at the point where the new knowledge and values of the institution struggle in impact with past experiences and responses of the student, that the student worker, by leadership and example, can help the student come forth with new and mature responses. This should be the assignment of the

worker in the extracurricular and residential areas. If he has the help of the faculty in these areas, all the better. Too often, in some institutions, he is all alone.

The lesson here indicated is very simple. The best dean of students, or member of his staff, is a good teacher who is qualified and interested in working with students on the campus beyond the class room. (Applause)

DEAN MARK SMITH: One member of our Commission, having heard John's paper, remarked that the difference between Mark and John is that he understood everything that Mark said and didn't like most of it. He understood very little of what John said, but he liked all of it. (Laughter)

We will have probably three more papers growing out of three other questions on the questionnaire, and I hope that they will broaden the view of the Commission as much as John's has.

I would now like to move to the resolutions which have been before you, and which are being recommended by the Commission as a result of its work during the past three or four years.

As I stated in the mimeographed report, it is the Commission's intention at this point to think in terms of concrete contributions which it might make. In this regard the Commission recommends that the following resolutions be adopted by the membership.

#### Resolution No. 1

That each member of NASPA, through means available to him and within the limits of his institutional situation, should establish close and continuing relationships with the behavioral science faculty members and departments of his institution, relationships which provide for contributions by the behavioral scientists to planning, research, and decisions in the student personnel area and for contributions by the student personnel staff to research in the behavioral sciences.

Jack, I think I might go ahead and read the second one, and then if there is a request for separation, you may give into it.

#### Resolution No. 2

That NASPA, through its membership, commissions, and committees, should seek to acquaint persons interested in careers in student personnel administration with the importance, in terms of employability and effectiveness, of training in an academic discipline and ability to qualify for academic rank and for classroom teaching.

It is felt that the adoption of these two resolutions by the membership would lay the groundwork for significant contributions by NASPA to the effectiveness of student personnel administrators and to stronger and more fruitful relationships between student personnel administration and the behavioral sciences. The remainder of the report you may read on the mimeographed sheet.

I would ask for the adoption of the report, and for consideration of the adoption of the resolutions contained in the report.

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: You have heard the motion. I think perhaps we might ask for adoption of the report first.

DEAN LACY: I so move.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: We have had a motion and a second. Is there any discussion or questions for the adoption of the report? If not, those in favor, please say, "aye." Opposed. So carried.

Would you like us to act now on the resolutions?

DEAN SMITH: Yes.

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: We have had a motion to accept the resolutions. I think I will turn this over to our President for action.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: I suggest that we consider these resolutions separately. The first resolution again, if I may read it. [Read Resolution No. 1.] What are your wishes in connection with this resolution?

DEAN HULET: I move adoption of the resolution.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt this resolution. Do we now have discussion?

DEAN BROADBENT: Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in favor of this resolution. May I raise one question, however? Might it be advisable to insert in the first part of it something to the effect that we, through our various institutions, and so on, establish -- what is the exact wording there, in the very beginning?

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: "Establish close and continuing relationships with the behavioral science faculty

members and departments."

DEAN BROADBENT: I am thinking here primarily of the context of our own campus, that we might like to suggest that we establish closer relationships with all departments of the faculty, and particularly with -- I know, for example, on many faculties people in the physical sciences, natural sciences, and so on, are as much concerned, or more concerned, with the relationship with the student personnel work as are those in the behavioral sciences. I do not argue for a moment that those are the areas in which the research stimulation is likely to come, but would I be completely out of line with the context, Mark, of what you are doing here, if I suggested that we say "with all faculty, all departments of the faculty, but particularly with ...". I see just a little limitation here in your resolution that might be broadened by just the addition of the one phrase.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thanks, Tom. Mark, would you comment on that?

DEAN MARK SMITH: I agree completely with your thinking. I think that since this resolution is really a request for action on the part of individual members, it is a franchise, in a sense. The Commission has been disturbed by indifference and complacency, plus the suggestion that the committee's attitudes are wonderful, for somebody else. I think we have to start some place for establishing close relationships, and perhaps we should start where we really need these relationships in terms of many aspects of our work. My only reaction is that I think this would be more directing, or more suggestive of means, with which the Commission might work in the next two years, than a broader statement.

DEAN JACK MATTHEWS: I do not want to belabor this point much too long, but I want to point out the wording in the first resolution is not quite proper. It says "that each member of NASPA, through means available to him ...". The membership of NASPA is an institutional one, therefore the wording is without proper meaning.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The membership is composed of institutional representatives, and I think that if you want to question this language, it might be perfectly proper to insert "institutional representatives."

DEAN MARK SMITH: All right. Fine.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Any further discussion?

... The question was called ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Are you ready to vote? All in favor please say, "aye." Opposed. We have adopted this resolution.

We now move to the second resolution, which I will read. [Read Resolution No. 2.]

As I read this, I presumed we might have considerable discussion. There will be some limitation as to time. What do you wish to do with this resolution?

DEAN BROADBENT: I move its adoption.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: It has been moved and duly seconded that we adopt this resolution. Now for discussion.

DEAN DAVID W. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to challenge the right of Commission V to make this resolution -- certainly it is an outgrowth of a very good study that they have conducted. If the resolution is passed this will say that the membership of this organization has set as one of its standards to convey to new people into our profession something which probably should better come out of Commission III. Because the resolution alludes to training of personnel administrators, probably the best thing I could do to express myself, Mr. Chairman, is to move that the second resolution be tabled, and further recommend that the Executive Committee allow Commission III to study -- possibly in cooperation with Commission V -- this resolution and bring it back to the floor at a later meeting.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: This is a motion from Dave to table and to refer to Commission III for study and for cooperation with Commission V.

DEAN DUSHANE: Second.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: It has been moved and seconded. Parliamentarian Don --

PARLIAMENTARIAN DUSHANE: No debate.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: No debate. We shall therefore move to vote on this motion to table. I am wondering if procedurally --

PARLIAMENTARIAN DUSHANE: I would suggest that the tabling part of the motion be deleted, and that it be simply referred, with a report to comment at a later date.

DEAN DAVID ROBINSON: I will accept that.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The motion will be then --

PARLIAMENTARIAN DUSHANE: To refer the resolution to Commission III for study.



PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: With the understanding that Commission III will work with Commission V in a study of this resolution.

DEAN DAVID ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Now this is open to debate?

PARLIAMENTARIAN DUSHANE: Yes, it is.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Discussion?

DEAN TURNER: I would be glad to have Mark's reaction to that.

DEAN MARK SMITH: I have a long and a short reaction. I will give you my short one. I am perfectly willing to have this referred to Commission III. I do think though that people in voting for the referral should not misunderstand the motives of Commission V. Commission V wishes, with this resolution, to make clear that it considers its responsibility to ask the membership to consider that there are many different means to the end of being an effective student personnel administrator.

It is the feeling of Commission V that we already have some habits of advisement of people with regard to what is the best preparation, and that this adds a new perspective to these habits of advisement; whereas, Dave, I would agree with you wholly that this is really a resolution to add this as one of the items of advisement that are practiced.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you, Mark.

DEAN DAVID ROBINSON: I want it understood that I do not challenge the intent or the wording of this resolution in any way. I just thought that Commission III, which is set up as a commission of NASPA to study and recommend avenues of training in the profession, should have an opportunity to study this with you and your associates before the body votes its adoption.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you, Dave. I would like to point out that in my opinion you have accomplished your purpose, Mark, in getting this matter before the floor. It is not a matter of immediacy at this particular moment. I think we have some time to give thoughtful consideration to this thing through Commission III and Commission V working together.

Any further comment? The question is called for. Are you ready to vote? All those in favor of this motion to refer to Commission III, please say, "aye." Opposed. The Chair rules that the ayes have it. Is there a call for

division? If not, the ayes have it, and it will be referred to Commission III.

I am sorry we are getting short on time. We do have an important resolution from Commission VI, which is going to deserve consideration from all of us.

DEAN GRIP (Commission VI, Student Financial Aids): You have before you three pieces of paper from the Commission. First, its report. Let me save time by just referring briefly to this report. I hope you will read it carefully.

The Commission, after considerable debate, is concerned that it accept the proper responsibilities of a Commission of this organization and work effectively during the year. Before you are some, I think, rather exciting proposals where individual members of the Commission have accepted the responsibility to carry forth certain studies.

We are, in addition to initiating these during the next two months, hoping that the executive committee will provide us with enough money to have a meeting along about June. We have already been in contact with a member of the staff of the Office of Education, and he thinks that he will be able to get assistance for us from research funds to complete these studies during the year.

There is a peculiar urgency, I think, on this because of the fluid situation in the financial aids field, and when I was called from the platform just a few minutes ago -- maybe I had better not mention his name -- down in the office of education, saying that we had proposed this study on Sunday night (I do not know whether the pipeline is working pretty well or not) ACPA had yesterday asked Rex Moon if he would head up a similar study and a similar committee for ACPA and he will be out at the ACPA meeting to set that up.

I do not think that we are competitive organizations, but I think this illustrates the importance that this organization be active and assume the responsibility for activity in this field.

... Following is the report of Commission VI on its activities and plans, which was not read:

#### I. ACTIVITIES:

The Commission is undertaking a series of related studies of the various types of financial aid currently available to college students. The emphases of these studies are primarily analytic and evaluative. However, because important details about many programs are not readily accessible, some studies will be directed to the collection of information. Individual Commission members

have already accepted responsibility for the following:

1. An analysis of the types of long-term loan programs available through banks and other commercial credit agencies. Especial attention will be devoted to computing the real interest costs of the various programs. This study will be headed by Leroy Luberg, University of Wisconsin.

2. An analysis of the important characteristics of various state scholarship programs and the size of such programs. (William Knapp, Wayne State University.)

3. An analysis of the conditions a sampling of colleges impose upon students accepting financial aid, with especial attention to the use of financial awards as instruments to affect student performance and the educational climate within the institution. (George Playe, University of Chicago.)

4. An analysis of the effect of various types of aid programs on high school students in the following respects:

- a. Do they encourage the talented but indigent youngsters to decide to attend college?

- b. Are there not so many different programs and so many different agencies making aid available that the net effectiveness is impaired by confusion?

- c. Similarly, do these many sources demand so much time in taking tests and making applications as to be of concern to the high schools and high school counselors?

5. A representative of the Office of Education, Mr. Clarence Deakins, a former member of NASPA, has agreed to provide the Commission with a list of questions about financial aid, mainly factual, on which that office lacks adequate information. The Commission has agreed to attempt to assist the Office of Education in obtaining such information.

Preliminary studies in each of the above areas are expected to be completed by June, and the Commission requests of the Executive Committee funds to meet in June to make arrangements for completion of these studies.

At the proposed meeting, we would also confer with representatives of the Office of Education to request financial support for completing the studies.

## II. PROPOSALS TO THE CONVENTION:

The Commission recognizes that the field of financial aids is as fluid, perhaps even as volatile, as any of

the areas of concern to student personnel administrators. A certain sense of urgency impels us as we contemplate this scene, because programs and principles of wide consequence and, probably, relative permanence are being born. Accordingly, the Commission has established three general principles on which it finds its members in complete and unanimous agreement.

The three proposed resolutions which have already been presented to you cover these areas. Your endorsement of these resolutions is sought in order that officers of the Association and members of the Commission may participate in the national discussions out of which programs will materialize.

...

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the report. This does not include the resolutions which I will propose separately.

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: We had a motion. Is there a second to adopt the report?

... The motion was duly seconded ...

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: It has been moved and seconded. All those in favor say "aye." Opposed. It is carried.

DEAN GRIP: Now you have before you what appear to be two resolutions. Actually the first one may be treated as two separate resolutions. This convention two years ago approved a resolution which supported the NDEA, and the manner in which the Office of Education had developed policy concerning the federal loan program, and particularly the legal interpretations which had been made in interpreting the meaning of the bill.

At that time we also passed a strong resolution asking for the abolition of the affidavit.

At this time we would like to introduce the resolution which reads as follows:

#### Resolution No. 1

Whereas qualified students in the United States are denied the opportunity of a college education at this time for lack of financial resources; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators strongly endorses continuation of the federal loan program for college students, and recommends that the present institutional limit of \$250,000 per annum be eliminated."

Now, Jack, would you like this treated separately?

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Yes, let's do. You have heard the resolution. What do you wish to do with it?

... Motion was made and seconded to adopt Resolution No. 1 ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Any discussion?

... The question was called ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The question has been called for. Are you ready to vote? All in favor say, "aye." Opposed. The resolution is passed.

DEAN GRIP: Let me point out that part of the reason for these three resolutions is that the Senate and House, as most of you know, have now passed bills. The Senate bill provides for a federal scholarship program; the House bill does not. In the conference committee which will shortly be set up there are two or three issues of critical difference between these two bills to which some of these resolutions are appropriate. The second resolution is:

#### Resolution No. 2

That the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators strongly urges the Congress to establish a federal scholarship program for academically qualified and financially needy students.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: You have heard the resolution. What do you wish to do with it?

DEAN LACY: I move its adoption.

VICE PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I second.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: It has been moved and seconded that we adopt this resolution. Any discussion?

DEAN JACK C. BUCKLE (Lycoming College): If I understand the present scholarship program, there is some disagreement between the House and the Senate, and part of this disagreement, or part of the procedure as planned for the awarding of these scholarships involves the award of the scholarships through the states. In certain states, particularly Pennsylvania and New York, there are rather rigid constitutional provisions which would make it questionable whether or not private institutions connected with religious organizations might be eligible -- whether the students at these places or in certain areas of study, might be ineligible to receive these scholarships.

DEAN GRIP: I am not sure I understand you. First, are you saying that students who had been awarded scholarships directly would be unable to attend these colleges, or the colleges would be unable to accept funds?

DEAN BUCKLE: If they are awarded through the states, which limit, which have constitutional limitations.

DEAN GRIP: All right. May I point out then that that comment is appropriate to the next resolution, rather than this one, that we purposely separated them. This resolution that is now before you simply endorses the federal scholarship program, and the House bill does not include a federal scholarship program. The Senate bill does.

DEAN BUCKLE: I am not familiar with the next resolution.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: It might help if he read the next one.

DEAN GRIP: I will read the next one at this moment then.

#### Resolution No. 3

Whereas, the fifty state commissions proposed to administer a federal scholarship program will create still more agencies which students needing financial assistance must seek out and consult, will create still more agencies which colleges must consult in determining financial awards to students, will thus create even greater complexity for students and colleges in the administration of financial aid programs. Therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators strongly recommends that the proposed federal scholarship program be administered directly through the colleges and universities, as the federal loan program is now administered, and not through new state commissions.

Now, this resolution is not introduced at this time. We are still discussing the previous one. This is a matter of information. You want to comment further on it?

DEAN BUCKLE: I would be perfectly happy with the second resolution then, if the third one were approved, but I would not be happy with the second one if the third one were not approved.

DEAN GRIP: The third one again is not very sensible if we do not approve the second one.

DEAN BUCKLE: Could they be combined in a single

vote?

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The Commission Chairman thinks they should be treated separately.

DEAN SWARTZBAUGH: I missed Carl's other report, which may elaborate on this. But I have similar questions inasmuch as my feelings on this would range from a strong opposition to strong support, depending on the methods by which the program was administered, the means by which we get the allocation to the really needy students, the size of the allocation of any program passed, which will affect whether or not it is really valuable to the students who need the money.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Carl, I wonder if it would not be possible to combine these two, by pointing out that we endorse a federal scholarship program for academically qualified and financially needy students, the program to be administered by the institutions. I ask you to comment on that.

DEAN GRIP: All right, I am agreeable to combining these two into one motion, these two separately printed resolutions.

DEAN MARK SMITH: Carl, I was taught when I was very young not to sign blank checks, especially when my father had a bank account. And I do not think we are endorsing anything that exists. We may be endorsing an attempt, but I do not think it is necessary for us to endorse this attempt. It does not need our endorsement.

I would move the tabling of the second resolution in anticipation of further work on the third.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: It has been moved and seconded that we table the second resolution, pending our action on the third resolution, is that correct?

DEAN MARK SMITH: Further study.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: This is not debatable. We have a motion which has been seconded to table the second resolution. All those in favor say, "aye." Opposed. The motion is defeated.

DEAN GRIP: Thank you. I think this Association has to decide whether it is going to participate in affecting decisions when they are being made and, Mark, this decision is going to be made within the next two or three months in all likelihood, and if we bring in a resolution a year from now, we are again somewhere behind the tail gate.

VICE PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I would like very much to speak out rather flatly against the proposal of my good friend Mark Smith, because one of the things that impresses me is that we have here a gathering of the most significant and -- well, I should say important educators in one field of this academic turmoil that the country is now in, and we have not in any way made our voice felt in Washington for anything.

I think we can certainly shave down the difficulties about the methods and the quantities of money, and the conditions that will be attached to it, but I think it would be a serious mistake for this organization not to be heard from on this matter.

... Cries of "Hear! Hear!"

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you, Vic. We are considering the combined resolution to endorse the federal scholarship program for academically qualified and financially needy students, with the administration of this to be administered by the institutions.

DEAN GRIP: I think that I would like to point out that this third resolution is certainly the most moot of the proposals that we have brought before you. It involves in our thinking the possibility that ultimately financial aid will be administered essentially outside of the institutions, almost totally outside, or totally through institutions.

Those of you who operate financial aid offices now know that we are in a motley situation where we make awards, and then we try to juggle and find out what other awards the student gets subsequently. There is a great deal of inefficiency here, not only in the administration of awards, but in using them as tools-of-education policy, seeing that they are effectively used.

So our position is a peculiar one. We are very strongly of the notion that the future of higher education demands substantial federal assistance to students. We are also of the strong conviction that to add more bureaus, more agencies to this picture will mean that they will be doing the logging in Washington, and that the institutions themselves become further removed from the making of policy.

We see this as an attempt to reassert this peculiar situation into which we are moving, with the federal government playing an increasingly stronger role, a kind of policy which will retain to the universities and the colleges the greatest possible amount of freedom to protect their diversity and to manage their affairs.

DEAN PAUL H. CONNOLE (Washington University): I would like to ask a question and make a statement. Are we



concerned here about the language of these resolutions, or do we have reservations about their purpose and intent?

I would like to speak about this from two points of view, one as a citizen who is against the establishment of more confusion in the administration of government funds, and secondly, as a member of a scholarship committee who spends six to eight weeks every spring searching for information about applicants.

If this is to be administered through a state agency, it is quite probable, red tape being what it is, that we will never get the information on these awards in time for us to make our final awards.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: You are speaking in favor of the resolution then, I take it?

DEAN CONNOLE: Absolutely. I would say if anybody has anything to say against the idea of the resolution, let us get it out now, but I think this body owes it to this body to get this thing on record to be in favor of it, and get Washington notified that we want it.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: We are now four minutes beyond our time limit. We are going to have to limit debate. May I ask for statements from those in opposition?

DEAN LACY: Move the question.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The question has been called. We will proceed to the vote. Would you again, please, state your combined resolution?

DEAN GRIP: The first resolution simply says that we strongly support a federal scholarship program. Combined in this motion is a second portion which says that we are in favor of these funds being awarded directly to institutions. And may I say parenthetically, what we are talking about is a pattern similar to that used for NDEA loans. In other words, I presume there would be a formula of allocation to the institutions and the state, based on the population of the state. But the money would be awarded directly to the institutions as are the NDEA loan funds.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: I assume if you vote to approve this resolution, that we will then make our position known to appropriate congressional committees, the U. S. Office of Education, and the American Council on Education. Is that correct?

DEAN GRIP: Yes. I should have pointed out before that this is one of our main concerns, that a commis-

sion such as this one has been unable in the interval between conventions to act, because it had no endorsement from the convention with which it could pretend to represent the sentiment of this body.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you. That was by way of explanation. The question has been moved and seconded. We will now vote. All those in favor please say, "aye." Those opposed. This motion is clearly carried to adopt the resolution. Thank you very much.

DEAN GRIP: Thank you, Jack. That is all.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Is Ray Whittaker here?

DEAN GRIP: He was here a minute ago. He went out to the office.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Some questions have been asked about the tours for this afternoon.

DIRECTOR WHITTAKER: The tours will leave at one o'clock promptly, on the Chestnut Street side.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The tours will leave promptly at one o'clock on the Chestnut Street Side.

Is there any further business that should come before this Forty-Fourth Annual Conference?

DEAN MATTHEWS: I was most interested in Fred Weaver's remark the other night about changing the name of this organization. I am strongly in favor of it, and I suspect the executive committee is giving some thought to this. I know time is short, but I wonder if there could be an expression from you, as the president, for a time table or some plan for bringing this about, such as changing the name to "The National Association of Deans of Students."

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Jack, I hope to have a few minutes, as we close the conference, to tell you something about the concerns of the executive committee, and some of our discussions of last night. I would hope to do that following this next session. I hope to get this one on its way now, and I will give you some of our thinking, and some of our planning on this as we wind this thing up just before noon. All right?

DEAN MATTHEWS: All right.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: I guess that concludes the Business session.

... The Business Session recessed at ten-five o'clock...

## FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

The Fifth General Session convened at ten-ten o'clock, John Summerskill, Vice President, Cornell University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: Would you kindly take your seats for the final session.

Our conference chairman has asked me to repeat the announcement that the buses for the tours this afternoon will be at the door of the hotel at one o'clock.

It is a pleasure to preside at this final session concerned with institutional limits on student freedoms, first because this is a topic of importance -- and of direct importance -- to all of us operating in this student personnel field; and secondly, it is my pleasure to be present with Father Weigel and Professor Brubacher this morning on the platform. I had breakfast with these two gentlemen, met them for the first time this morning, and discovered to my particular delight that they are both deeply concerned with the intellectual development of our students, scholarship at our universities, and preserving the academic integrity of our colleges and universities. It seems to me that this is the central purpose of all our jobs, and that as student personnel officers our mission is to support and make arrangements and give it encouragement so that our students can develop as students intellectually.

We are particularly appreciative to Father Weigel who is in residence at the University of Chicago during these immediate weeks giving a series of lectures on the subject, "Is God Dead or Alive?" It occurred to me, Father, that this might be a very appropriate subject for this group.

Father Weigel says of himself that he is an ecclesiologist-theologian. Professor Brubacher asked him if he also classified himself as a gentleman and theologian, and he accepted that graciously, and I think indicated the accuracy of that statement. He received his training in theology at Woodstock College and in Rome. He had eleven years of, I am sure, a most fascinating experience at the Catholic school in Chile, Latin America, where he was a professor of theology. He has been at Woodstock College for the past fourteen years, and Father Weigel is known throughout this country in his talks and his stimulation of the thinking and the conceptualization of our students.

Father Weigel will speak to us for some twenty minutes. Professor Brubacher will speak for a similar period of time, and we hope, at that point, to have provoked

discussion directly from the floor. Father Gustave Weigel.  
(Applause)

REV. GUSTAVE A. WEIGEL, S.J. (Professor of Ecclesiology, Woodstock College): When we were discussing the honorary degree that Professor Brubacker gave me, gentlemen, I said that I had papers to prove that I was a scholar, but I had no papers to prove that I was a gentleman. (Laughter)

The question which seems heated at this particular meeting is one that interests me very much, although I am not a school administrator and never was, because for me, your question is related to one which is more basic, and more fundamental, and that is the nature of the university. But do not get worried, I am not going into any metaphysics.

Actually we are dealing with what we call higher education, the university. That word, the university, in our time always denotes something intellectual. It is the academy. Yet when the word was first used, it did not mean that at all.

I am sure that those of you who have been to Rome have visited the Compìdoglio and that was where the different guilds had their main offices. When you see the different offices, they have the name in Latin, and you have, for example, the "universitas pistrinum." This was the guild of the bakers. In the thirteenth century, when places that later took on our own meaning of university started, universitas merely meant another guild, and these guilds were structured in different ways. At Bologna, one of the oldest universities, it was the "universitas scholarum," the guild of students, and the rector was a student, and the whole organization was a student organization. They hired their professors.

At other universities, the "universitas," the guild, the corporation was of the magistrate, the magistrorum, and the students came to that corporation. But the University of Paris worked out a scheme which was subsequently followed by all. It was the Universitas Scholarum et Magistrorum. Both students and teachers formed a guild and corporation. I say, that particular form is the one which survived and triumphed.

Now of course the University is not the same thing everywhere. I need hardly stress that; you know it. A European university is different from an English university, and both of them are very different indeed from an American university.

I was always somewhat irked by the university situation in Latin America. There was such turmoil, and I always felt needless turmoil, but there was very little you

could do about it. It was proper to the type of university they had built up for themselves.

Now I am going to speak just for myself. I do not represent a party, and this is not a partisan report. In the years in which I have been associated with many universities and in many lands, I have come to some conclusions, and I offer them to you very humbly. They are my views. Perhaps my Catholic colleagues will reject them, but they are free to reject them, and I am free to propose them.

Student freedom. Now it seems to me the operational word here is not freedom; the operational word is student. And he is a student of what I want to call the university. And what do I mean by university? I want to describe it only. I do not wish to give any definition. I conceive it to be an institutionalized social center for the training of late adolescents and early adults. This is what Aristotle would have called the material cause.

How is this training achieved? Through association with a fraternity of scholars at work. This would be the formal element. The training given in an army barracks is not the training given at the university. They are very different. What makes the university training specifically its, is the fact that the training is achieved through association of young people with the fraternity of scholars at work.

If this description be in any way valid, we can draw a conclusion immediately. First of all, the student is not born in the university. He enters it, and by reason of his entry into the university we necessarily have some kind of tacit contract.

The university must admit him, receive him and take him and the conditions for admission will be known to the student and he accepts them.

The third point, which is also a conclusion from the initial description, is rather important. In terms of logic, the student is posterior to the society, which is the university, and that society is a subsidiary society in general society. That subsidiary society necessarily has a structure, a structure imposed by logic itself. It is not a question now of any great rules and conclusions. The purpose which this subsidiary society has imposes, in terms of reason, a certain structure.

In this structure, as I like to think of it, the important element is not the student, but the faculty. I would like to think that the university exists primarily for the professors. I do not think many will agree with me. Likewise, I am well aware that the word university is not an eternal thing. It changes. In the course of years,

under the influence of environment and the stimuli of history, we shall see developments which would seem very strange to those who began the whole enterprise. This is to be expected. The university is a living thing in a living society, and the very notion of life is a notion of change.

Even though I consider the faculty the important element in the university, we must have likewise in this society an arm which makes the whole thing go. This I would call the administration. The administration, therefore, is definitely a part of this subsidiary society called the university. It is the function of the administration to see to it that the finality of the university is achieved with the greatest degree of efficiency possible.

We expect therefore that the administration will make it possible and even easy that the faculty will do its work of rational contemplation. I will consider that this will be the first function of administration. First, but not the only one. It must also see to it that the students can have effective intercourse with the professors who are the scholars. They must take care of both things, this in terms of the logic of the institution itself.

But the university administration will have more to do, especially when we consider the modern American university which has branched out so, and has taken on obligations and duties to general society, which were not accepted in the past.

Consequently, the administration will see to it that the conditions of living together be such as to foster the purpose of learning. It is precisely the learning situation which is the occupation of the university administrator.

Now the administrator of the university is only a member of a subsidiary society. Whatever powers he has derive from the institution itself and will go up to the finality of the university, but not beyond it. Consequently those particular activities and concerns which the faculty and the students have outside of the limits of university life are of no concern to the administrator. The administrator cannot go beyond the limit of the university situation.

First of all, we have the mature scholars and therefore we have a right to expect that they will be responsible members of this society, and in their spirit of responsibility they will not be annoyed, at least not more than is necessary.

The student at the university is not a full adult. He has not achieved the fullness of his maturity

but on the other hand he is not to be considered as an irresponsible school boy or school girl. He has achieved a great deal of responsibility even though the achievement is not final and perfect.

Where the student action does not impinge on the university situation, he has to be left free. He is a free agent. Free agents, indeed, just submit to certain regulations which are the concern of other agencies in the general community. And so it will be with the students too. But it is not the function of the university to worry about his actions outside of the university.

Are there any restrictions placed on the student by the very fact that he belongs to a university community? I think it is obvious that there are such restrictions and modifications. He must respect the logical structure of his society. That is the basis of the contract between himself and the community. He was admitted into the community; he was born into it. This community has its logical structure, as I have indicated, but this logical structure is always under the influence of history. It is influenced by the community where it exists, and where it evolved.

Now this realistic and existential structure is precisely what the university concretely is. It is necessary for the student, as for the professor, to recognize this structure. Since it is a human structure, it will change, and consequently advocacy of change is certainly in order. But the notion must be on both sides, the faculty and the students, that the structure is there and it must be respected.

There is one other element that is highly important for a university. The university is not something merely in the order of Platonic ideas. And the university necessarily depends on the general public for its resources. The teachers have to eat, the students have to live in the general community. Therefore, the university itself lives off an image. The university wants to enhance this image in the public eye, and this is an obligation of all the members of the university community. They must enhance the image, because to a great extent they live off that image.

General society must give it funds. Now it is precisely here where the administration has to work. The administration has to balance the two currents which are necessary in life, a conservation of logical structure, and at the same time, make progress to a structure which is more efficient.

The administration must likewise so act that the public image of the university be constantly enhanced.

The seventh proposition that I would suggest is:

much of university life on the student level of this closed community can best be arranged by the university members dwelling on that level, the students. Hence student action in terms of reasonable expectancy should be a student responsibility.

This means that we would expect from the administration that it will delegate to the students its own power of conservation and progress. In such a delegation, we must not imagine that the administration loses the power which it delegates. On the other hand, we do have the right to expect that delegated power is not hampered to such an extent that it ceases to be power.

We want therefore the administration to respect the responsibility of the students on their own level of life in the university. They must delegate power, the power which is proper to the administration, so that it will function well. We have been told over and over again that the best administrator is not the man who tries to do it all, but wisely delegates portions of his power to men who are well equipped to exercise it.

When you have a multiplicity of actions and interests, it is impossible for one administrator to do them all well. He will look for those men, or those groups, which can exercise the power wisely and effectively.

High domain will remain with the administration but it should be high domain. The interference should not be frequent, and there must be a respect of the power delegated.

The 8th proposition, therefore would come out something like this: Student freedom is very real, and if there is no student freedom, something is wrong with the particular university which is trying to fulfill the university aim. Although it is very real, it is not absolute. It is relative to the situation of the student and the student is a junior member, a true member but a junior member of a scholarship corporation, which necessarily must exercise its own nature, and necessarily must protect its own image.

The proper functioning of the overall enterprise is the responsibility of administration, but administration should, in purposes of good health, delegate this power to those who can use it best. After all, we have that old saying, only the man who wears the shoe knows where the shoe pinches. Consequently, the students on their level of university life are the ones who know best where the shoe pinches, and wisely to them will be delegated the power to remove the cause of the pinching.

The 9th proposition. The very nature of the



scholarly community, working in optimum conditions will demand that the administration be homogenous with the university nucleus, the faculty. It is precisely here where the changes which are now being worked out on the campuses produces a real problem. Our administrators are not homogenous with the students. Our administrators are not homogenous with the faculty. And this is a real problem. You cannot regret it, but you must face the fact that an administrator is a specialist, and with the multiplicity, ever growing, of our university life in America, they must use specialists.

It is true that in simple university conditions, as in Germany for example, not much administration is needed because the university does not do as much as is done in our own country. Therefore, they will take from the faculty their deans and their presidents. When you go to the president's room, you will be surprised how little apparatus he has to run the university. But that is not our American situation.

Nevertheless, the American situation presents a problem which must be studied seriously. The problem is that our administration is not homogenous with the faculty, our administration is not homogenous with the students. I might almost go so far as to say that it is the instruction of an alien power. I do not like administrators.

The 10th and last proposition. The very nature of scholarship, which is an essay in free inquiry and rational discourse, requires not only freedom, which is its first condition, but it also requires serenity. Consequently violence, even when introduced by coercion, should be at the strictest minimum. Coercion should never be maximal. Only that amount of coercion should be introduced which is absolutely necessary for the atmosphere of serenity and freedom of the university community.

For this very reason, the coercion should not be in terms of police power. The old universities which have functioned so many centuries and with such noble results usually get around this by custom. Let custom produce a certain amount of limitation of personal freedom. If you use law which must be enforced by police you produce an environment which is not serene, and which is not an environment of effective freedom. Custom and law are nicely described in an old Spanish saying which means "Custom is what the people spontaneously do. Law is what the King orders."

We should develop therefore in the university community custom, a relation by spontaneous consent. The English say it so nicely, "You know, that isn't done." They do not appeal to any policeman. There is a consensus in the community, it just isn't done. It works out beautifully. Therefore, regulation by spontaneous consent, rather than

by law, which is regulation by imposed fiat of a directive authority.

I offer you these ten propositions for your thought and for your discussion. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: Thank you very much, Father Weigel, for your wisdom which has been brought to us from a life of learning. I personally very much agree with your conceptualization of freedom for the students and the faculty as they go about the central purposes of the university, and I very much agree with your thoughts about the delegation of power to those most concerned with their lives as students and teachers, to the utmost extent to which this is feasible.

In our discussion period, I would like, if you would, to indicate how the objectives of the faculty and the students in our complicated universities today, the necessary tools and conditions, can be provided without an administration to do these things on behalf of the students and faculty, and furthermore, how you as a faculty member can expect the administration to serve your ends without the fullest possible support of our difficult jobs. This is one question that I would like to see a faculty member address himself to fully.

Our second speaker, Professor John Brubacher. The first thing we learned at this meeting about Professor Brubacher, at breakfast this morning, is that he is positively the only man not from Philadelphia who genuinely liked Philadelphia scrapple, and we were confused momentarily until we learned that he has a Mennonite background, and then the breakfast world at least made sense again.

Professor Brubacher is a graduate of Yale University. He did his graduate work in the field of education at Columbia. He has taught at the American University in Beirut. He has spent a year in Japan. He has been a member of the faculty in the Department of Education at Yale University for some thirty years and for the past four years he has been a faculty member at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan. Professor Brubacher was a recently elected Vice President of the National Society of Colleges of Teacher Education, and he is a member of the Board of Content Editors of the Library of Education.

He has, at least, a close familial connection with the work of many of us in the room today, in that his son is a graduate student at the University of Michigan, who is also an Assistant Head Resident in one of Michigan's large dormitories.

Professor Brubacher is going to bring his insight

and wisdom to us now, and we are delighted, sir, that you would come from the University of Michigan to us in Philadelphia this morning. Professor Brubacher. (Applause)

PROFESSOR JOHN S. BRUBACHER (Professor of Higher Education, University of Michigan): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have entitled this paper, which I am going to read to you this morning

#### GROUND RULES FOR FREEDOM ON THE CAMPUS

In recent years there has been quite an outcropping of issues involving student freedom on the American campus. This situation stands in sharp contrast to the one of a century ago. A hundred years ago the dominant mood of the American college campus was not one of freedom but of prescription. Not only was the student's curriculum prescribed but the college in loco parentis laid down dozens of rules dictating his personal behavior.

Shortly after the Civil War all this began to change. A potent factor in the change was the impact of the German university on the American campus. One of the outstanding characteristics of the German university was its spirit of akademische Freiheit, i.e., academic freedom. It is significant for our purposes that there were two aspects of German akademische Freiheit, Lernfreiheit and Lehrfreiheit, freedom of the learner and freedom of the teacher. Lernfreiheit, the freedom of the student, concerned his freedom to choose what he would study, when he would study it, in what sequence he would study, and his freedom from all examinations except the final one. Translated to the American campus this freedom took the form of the struggle for the elective curriculum. This was the movement long led by Charles William Eliot of Harvard.

As everyone knows, the struggle for free electives was not particularly concerned with freedom to study or take a stand on unpopular issues of the day. Freedom to espouse unpopular causes was rather a phase of the battle to introduce Lehrfreiheit, freedom of the professor, on the American campus. From the 1890's to the 1960's there has been a protracted battle to assure professors freedom to investigate, publish, and teach the truth as they see it. In spite of this extended period academic freedom is still unfinished business. What is of most interest in this unfinished business in recent years is the extent to which students are getting in on the act. It is as if a second phase of Lernfreiheit, freedom for the learner, were developing. The student's interest in freedom today is very similar to that of the professor. Having long ago won the free elective curriculum, the modern student wants to insure himself freedom to learn unpopular alternatives to conventional solutions of modern problems. Hence his problems in inviting off-beat speakers to his campus, participating in

"sit-ins," joining picket lines, and the like.

As the student moves into this new or redefined area of *Lernfreiheit* it becomes necessary to define terms to avoid misunderstandings. Probably these terms can best be defined in a preliminary way in terms of the struggle professors suffered to insure themselves the measure of academic freedom and civil liberty they enjoy at the present time. The basic principle here seems to concern commitment to a progressive society. Such a society must have a growing edge. The growing edge is made up of individuals whose individuality propels them to make departures from the conventional way of doing things. If we want to advance to a state of social affairs better than the present one, we must not only allow but encourage this sort of deviation. Furthermore, we must have the courage which Socrates long ago urged, the courage to follow the argument whithersoever it leads! To suppress an argument before one has heard it out declares a lack of confidence in our ability to guide our destiny by rational processes.

The principle we are establishing here is not just academic. It has a political corollary as well. Take Congressional immunity as an instance. According to this principle a Congressman is free to make any statement he wishes on the floor of Congress with regard to the welfare of the body politic. Even if his remarks sound subversive, treasonable, or just crazy no penalty can be levied against him for his apparently unconventional behavior. He cannot be fined, neither can he be imprisoned, for his unusual views. Why is this? Because our Congress is committed to examining any suggestion sincerely put forward as an improvement on the status quo. The Congress need not accept any crackpot idea but it owes a duty to itself and the nation to see whether even the most unconventional ideas may not have some modicum of merit in them.

If this is the case with the national Congress then it would seem that somewhere in the educational system there must be a comparable place, notably the university, where, without fear of economic or political reprisal, professors can follow the argument whithersoever it may lead even though it sometimes leads to strange and unexpected, even unpalatable conclusions. As already strongly implied, the justification of such a wide range of freedom is basically not personal but social. There is no denying its deep gratification to the professor. But more important is its contribution to social progress. And not least in its contribution to social progress is its rearing of a generation of students trained in the discipline of freedom and therefore competent to carry the search for truth to ever widening frontiers of our ignorance. Unless the professor enjoys a maximum freedom, his students will be stunted and dwarfed in their efforts to surpass him.

There is also a moral dimension to freedom not to be overlooked. What kind of moral young men and women do we want as products of higher education? It is a long standing ideal that we want young folk who are worthy of moral autonomy, that is, young people who are capable of making responsible decisions on their own. If they are constantly under the necessity of taking their direction from others, they will never be able to develop their own resources for meeting novel situations. The only way to develop independence and initiative is to be thrown into situations where independence and initiative are required. The older generation may hold its breath while the outcome hangs in the balance, but it must remember that risk and jeopardy are the inevitable accompaniments of the exercise of freedom.

In spite of the strong case I have tried to make for freedom of the mind for both students and professors you may still have misgivings. You may say this is all well and good in an ivory tower but the modern university is anything but an ivory tower. Indeed it is so caught up in the stream of daily affairs that the exercise of freedom is bound to be conditioned by local circumstances. Perhaps it is necessary, therefore, to lay down some ground-rules for exercise of freedom on the campus. Let us examine some possible ground-rules.

1. Some think there may be occasion when, paradoxically, freedom must be curbed in some limited area in order to preserve the more general case for freedom. Such a case may arise where a professor uses the university as a sounding board for some view which, however true or false, is repugnant to the public. The fear is that the broadcast of the distasteful views of this one man, or the small minority in agreement with him, will bring discredit on the good name of the whole university. Consequently they would propose some such ground rule as would require professors to file their proposed remarks with some university official to get his approval before making them.

Salutary as such a ground rule might appear, it is very risky business. If the university assumes responsibility for censoring professorial remarks which it does not approve, then it follows that it assumes responsibility for everything which it permits them to say. This is a grave responsibility, indeed, for any university to assume. Much better would seem to be the policy of not identifying the university with the views of any of its faculty. The university should be a place where many diverse views can be expressed but where none has official endorsement. Under such a policy the university might suffer occasionally from intemperate remarks by one of its faculty but this would be as nothing compared to the risk of being responsible for everything they might say. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that the impartial character of the university be closely guarded and preserved.

2. Some approve academic freedom in general but draw a line when it comes to teaching "subversive" ideas. They see much good in freedom to elaborate ideas consistent with the present frame of government but at freedom to attack that frame of government, there they draw a distinction. They seem to favor freedom to amend the present frame but not freedom to replace it with another. Again, this is a very dubious ground rule to adopt. Basically there is a fear here to follow the argument whithersoever it may lead. Perhaps what is feared to be subversive would turn out on bold examination to be better than the existing system. At least there must be freedom to examine that possibility. Moreover, it is important here to avoid confusion between the criticism or overthrow of ideas or beliefs and the actual overthrow of government itself. The one is in the sphere of thought and the other in the sphere of action.

In any event, we should be at least as courageous in facing the issue of subversion as were our forefathers. Let us particularly remember the remarks of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln on the matter of subversion. In his inaugural address in 1801 Jefferson stated:

If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

While Jefferson confined himself to the realm of ideas, Lincoln made so bold as to move into the realm of action. Said he:

Whenever (the people) shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it.

3. Still others think that the exercise of freedom on the campus is conditioned by the existing state of social affairs at any given time and place. During times of peace and security they favor the wide exercise of freedom. But during times of national calamity such as war or severe economic depression they favor a ground rule restricting freedom. Their thought is that while the ship of state is passing through heavy seas we should not add to the forces which are causing it to pitch and lurch. Indeed, one added thrust and perhaps the ship of state will founder. All this may be true but it is equally possible that a failure to freely examine the aims and conduct of the war or the structure and function of the economic system might fail to reveal the key to its salvation.

4. Some think a much needed ground rule is one which would protect the professor in the exercise of freedom

when he speaks or writes within his field of competence but withholds it when he makes utterances outside his field of specialization. As a matter of fact we can distinguish two kinds of freedom in this instance, academic freedom and civil liberty. Academic freedom is predicated on specialized knowledge; civil liberty is the freedom anyone has to speak his mind whether he has special competence or not. In neither case can a man be fined or imprisoned for delivering himself of his convictions. In neither case, too, can a man be protected against loss of fame or reputation among his friends and colleagues.

But society does try, too often unsuccessfully, to protect the professor against loss of his university post in case he says something which shocks or outrages the public. It does not offer this protection to the average citizen. If the latter loses his economic livelihood, well that is just one of the risks he must run in exercising his civil liberties. So, when the professor speaks outside his chair, he is just another citizen with no shield against the shafts of public criticism.

Now what about the merits of such a ground rule? Two objections may be interposed. In the first place it seems inadvisable that being a professor should handicap a person as a citizen. To ask the professor to surrender some of his citizenship will handicap recruitment of good men for the profession. Certainly men entering other professions like law, medicine, and engineering do not expect to surrender some of their citizenship. The A.A.U.P., it may be noted, takes a dim view of preventing the professor from taking an active interest in movements which he believes to be in the public interest. In the second place, one must be today increasingly cautious in delimiting the professor's area of competence. Such areas are no longer stationary, especially with the increasing importance of interdisciplinary thinking and research. Some of the most important progress is made today by those who press to enlarge the areas of their interests.

5. We may now inquire whether we need a ground rule to cover the case where a person claims the right of academic freedom but at the same time is a member of a party which dictates the views of its members. We often think of communism as such a party. When the party line changes individual party members are expected to change their view no matter what their individual judgment may be. Now many think it would be a sound ground rule to refuse freedom to anyone who is not free to make up his own mind. In the case of communism the matter looks quite simple. But when you apply this rule to other organizations -- professional, political, and religious -- unexpected difficulties arise. For instance, what about membership in an orthodox church or being a member of a party caucus? Or again, on the professional level, hardly any professor has personally tested all

the conclusions he teaches in his own field of competence. He necessarily accepts much on the authority of specialists in his field. There is probably need for a ground rule here but before applying it one should demand clear-cut proof the professor is teaching what he personally does not believe to be true.

6. There is an important corollary of this case and that is where the party line directly opposes academic freedom. Should we not surely have a ground rule denying freedom to such people? If the sincere advocate of totalitarian institutions merely advocates the curtailment or abolition of academic freedom I presume we ought to hear him out. We ought to have courage to follow the argument whithersoever it may lead. But if there is danger that the opponent of academic freedom is merely hiding in the folds of the cloak of freedom to await the appropriate moment when he can spring a coup d'etat, this is a danger which the adherents of freedom cannot abide. Freedom can only breathe where rational processes are in control.

7. We come now to one final possible ground rule and the one of principal interest on this occasion. We have already noted that academic freedom is something which the professor enjoys on behalf of his students. Now should the students' age and immaturity be the occasion for qualifying the exercise of freedom on the academic campus? There are two angles from which to examine this question. From the first angle, should the professor pull his intellectual punches because of the immaturity of his students? The answer is, of course, that students are of varying levels of immaturity. In the graduate school it would certainly seem as if no punches should be pulled, no intellectual holds barred. Men and women being prepared to carry on research on the frontiers of knowledge, men and women being prepared to take the places of their elders, surely these must be subjected to all the rigors of pursuing the argument whithersoever it may lead. In the undergraduate college the spirit should be the same. If there is any distinction between the two, it might be that in the graduate school the professor can feel free to go all out for some single point of view which he believes to be the truth while in the undergraduate college we would expect him to familiarize his students with all the major viewpoints.

From the second angle, should the student enjoy the same freedom in pursuing his academic ends as the professor does in pursuing his? The question arises principally under two guises, when student organizations invite speakers to the campus and when they exercise their civil liberties as in "sit-ins," picketing, and the like. Are there any ground rules to guide the students as they give this new American twist to Lernfreiheit? I submit there are and that students could learn much from the discussion we have already given ground rules for the professor.



Let us start with students inviting speakers to the campus. The Alger Hiss case at Princeton is a concrete instance. Students should be aware that the university will be a sounding board for views that may shock the public. But the main point is not so much that the speaker's views are shocking or subversive as enlisting the student's aid in maintaining the impartial character of the university rostrum. Some speakers are a real threat to this impartiality. Students must understand, as already seen, that some speakers are not free to follow the argument whithersoever it may lead. If so they may violate the academic spirit of free inquiry. Other speakers are contemptuous of the very freedom they enjoy. Perhaps we ought to hear such out but if they seem to threaten the freedom of the platform they occupy, then students ought to be among the first to deny their presence in the university.

Next let us take the case of the student's civil liberties. If he wants to be a freedom rider, a picket, or a sit-in he must realize that his right to do so is based on civil liberty and not academic freedom. If he suffers loss of fame or fortune, well, this is one of the risks of a free citizenry. There is no shielding students from these darts of fortune. We can commend them for their new interest in public affairs. Indeed, we are happy to note this instance of the modern pedagogy of learning by doing. But students should not forget that this kind of learning should be balanced by knowledge, and, at the university, theoretical knowledge. At every turn, as a matter of fact, a precondition of freedom is knowledge.

Finally a word to the public. It is easy for the public to become alarmed at what is going on in the undergraduate mind. When youth wants to be informed about off-beat points of view the public is all too likely to think that the mind of youth is in danger of being subverted. At this point there are a few ground rules which the public might observe. The first is that the infinitive "to teach" does not necessarily mean to indoctrinate or to inculcate. "To teach," especially if we carry on in the great tradition of Socrates, can mean to reason, to think, to discriminate, to judge, to evaluate. If this is what it means to follow the argument whithersoever it may lead, we need have no fear when off-beat points of view are taught at the university.

A second rule might remind the public that if our country is really devoted to the cause of freedom, we must expect its pursuit to involve risk. When you follow the argument whithersoever it may lead you can never be sure where you are coming out. This is both the jeopardy and glory of freedom.

A final rule is to remember the views of Jefferson and Lincoln on freedom to change our institutions. If

these great tribunes of the people were unafraid to examine our institutions fundamentally, then neither should we!  
(Applause)

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: Thank you, Professor Brubacher, for an enlightening and most thoughtful presentation.

It seems to me that with respect to our subject, "Institutional Limits Upon Student Freedoms," Father Weigel has suggested that the customs of the university do, in fact, impose some limiting circumstances, and that these are valid; and has also suggested that the notion of the image, or the impact of the university upon the surrounding community is important, and it imposes some limitations on student freedoms.

Professor Brubacher has suggested several possible limitations, as I understood his address. One is the possibility that ideas, or objectives, are not introduced into the academic community in such a way that they could be openly and freely discussed, so that reason will prevail. And I, at least, drew the implication that if this were the case, this would be a limiting circumstance, if ideas or actions were brought into the university which were not able to be seen, discussed and argued through openly.

I believe also that Professor Brubacher indicated his view that interjecting into the academic community persons or ideas which in themselves attacked the notion of freedom or limited the freedom of the students and faculty, is not tolerable.

Having said this, I wonder if our two speakers might comment briefly on each other's address, to sharpen somewhat the matter of where these institutional limitations lie, and perhaps bring them to some more specific terms, that again the administrators who must deal with these matters on a day-to-day basis will have a point of departure for questions.

Father Weigel, would you care to comment on your colleague's address?

REV. WEIGEL: I think that Professor Brubacher and I would hold the same general principles, but there is one point of divergence. I made much of the necessity for the university to have an image of itself, and an image which it likewise wishes to communicate and propose to the community at large, and it has an obligation to enhance that image.

Now that image will certainly cut down the area of freedom, both of professors and students, precisely because, I believe, that freedom itself necessarily gives to

individuals the right to organize a university according to the image they themselves have of it. If they avail themselves of this right the image will necessarily produce certain controlling influences on all concerned in that particular university.

In the general abstract, I suppose it would be quite all right if a homeopathic school of medicine would reject the notion of homeopathy entirely. Yet the image of this particular school of medicine is that it is in defense of homeopathy. There is an inner contradiction. If the professor has the right to reject homeopathy altogether and makes this quite clear in his classes, or if the students are violently demanding that there be courses in allopathy, the image of this particular school is being violated.

I would say under those conditions, I do not see how this type of student, or that type of professor, could logically work there. Both, it seems to me, have their freedom to go to another which does not support such an image.

I believe this is rather important. I believe that freedom is varied, fundamental to all kinds of intellectual work, but I feel that we are also free to introduce freely certain limitations of area in which we will work.

I believe that Professor Brubacher's university is a far more universal thing than the one I am contemplating. I am contemplating the university that actually has its foundations on earth. (Laughter)

PROFESSOR BRUBACHER: I think this is a very important issue which Father Weigel has raised. I do not doubt for one minute, as he said, that different institutions can get something and found themselves along different sorts of lines suiting their particular image. I presume the Jesuit College to which he belongs, have a certain image of themselves. And I presume that state colleges have a certain image of themselves.

What I would contend for is that the proper image of any university is the image that Socrates gave us, the willingness to follow the argument whither it may lead us. And any university that does not have the courage to do that, I do not think it is a university.

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: In posing questions from the floor, would you kindly identify yourself and your institution, for our recorder, please.

DEAN WM. L. SWARTZBAUGH (Amherst College): I want to say hello. I am concerned with one question which I think some of us talked about during luncheon sessions and otherwise.

Some of us who have been in both large and small universities recognize that perhaps a significant part of the image of the large university is one which reflects change, where it is awfully hard to develop custom. So we do not have some of these built-in traditions to rely upon.

It is in these same universities where students with very diverse backgrounds from other parts of the country, with different conceptions of what they come to the university for, find it difficult to get together, or develop some focus, some criteria on which, or with which to select speakers to participate in social and political action.

This is not a problem on the smaller campus, with another kind of image, with a kind of stability, with a highly disciplined conception of what it can do in certain situations.

I am wondering how we reconcile these two different kinds of experience, two different kinds of images. I think for the large university this is a very great problem, how we meet students, at what points we meet students and help them develop some of the criteria for selection of speakers for the kinds of action which they take, and a criteria which are in keeping with the objectives of the university.

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: Could you hear the question in the far reaches of the room? Would you like to comment, Father?

REV. WEIGEL: The difference of universities necessarily produces a difference of solution of the problem that has been proposed.

A public university, financed by public funds, certainly must have a much broader principle on the amount of discussion it will admit. The Socratic principle is one that I very much admire, but the point is that it is an argument, and being an argument it begins from premises. And precisely it is here where the public university will have a greater difficulty in deciding how the argument flows, because I do not think it is the part of a public university to limit the premises, and therefore any kind of argument is possible.

Now the students and their lecturers. I see no difficulty in a group of students from any university, really, inviting a lecturer, but they must not involve the university in some kind of unpleasant dilemma. Let them hire the Lyric Theater, and it will let the man speak. It is no longer an involvement of the university itself.

I insist that the student has a life that is

much bigger than his university life. He is a citizen, at least a young citizen, and consequently, beyond the academic community of the university, it is none of the university's business if they want to bring this or that man in, in to the Lyric Theater; let them do so. It does not involve the university.

The problem is going to be a very practical one, and I am quite sure it is going to be solved in a practical way. There will be all kinds of pressures pro and con, and I have noticed this about students, that although they may be very idealistic in their statements, they can be extremely practical when they try to put the thing together. I have had to take part in the last fifteen years in the so-called religious emphasis weeks. In one university it was called "Be Kind to God Week." (Laughter)

As long as this program was completely in the hands of the students, it was nothing but an 8-ring circus, with trained seals brought in from the outside. You started usually sometime about seven o'clock in the morning, and kept on working until about one o'clock the next morning, and it didn't do anybody any good.

It was of course a student activity. That it was active was clear enough. (Laughter) But it seemed to be activity without any goal and without any consideration of the results of such activity.

Now again, without any revolt, without any kind of complaint, without raising fundamental issues, the religious emphasis week is gradually fading away. In its place, and sometimes with the same name, more responsible members of the community, of the university community, members taken from administration, or members taken from the professor rate, have taken it over.

It is indeed true that they need student aid, and they enlist it, but shall we say the heavy thinking is no longer done by the students. The quality of the Religious Emphasis Week, as a result, has improved, and it does not require the grinding down of the three trained seals into small bites, offering food to nobody.

Now here is a practical solution of a problem, completely practical. It was realized, and the students in their own way began to realize that the organization of this particular program was not effective.

Likewise, I think you will find that students have tremendous initial power. They are good at spurts, but they get tired if the race goes on. This must be taken into account. I believe that the present arrangement, where there is student and faculty collaboration, and where the students are willing to listen to what the

professor has to say, and even respect him in terms of his maturity, has produced a better thing. It has worked out, I say, quite practically. No one raised issues of principle and when the students themselves saw it worked out better, they did not insist on running the program.

I believe that most of these situations can be worked out in terms of give and take, which is the American way by and large. You know, there is an extreme right -- a nuisance; an extreme left -- a nuisance; it is that unwatched middle that somehow or other keeps things going.

I would still insist that a public institution must naturally give a greater amount of freedom on the kind of thought developed. An institution which is not public and is nevertheless an exercise of freedom, I think in logic can curtail the area of limits.

PROFESSOR BRUBACHER: I agree with Father Weigel quite definitely to the question that was put, that very much of this is a matter of practical manipulation. I think there is an ideal here which we ought to work toward, but I recognize that in some communities one is far away from it, and it will take farther to work toward it than the others. But I want to be clear as to what that idea is.

He makes a rather interesting distinction between public and private institutions, indicating that -- at least it seemed to me -- that there is a larger measure of freedom to be expected from public than private institutions. I do not understand this. I do not see why the private institution should not aim at a conception of freedom quite as extensive as those we see in the public institutions.

REV. WEIGEL: A distinction must be made. I was in Washington last week and we settled all the problems of education. (Laughter) We were invited by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Our group was just interested in education. I do not see how any problems are left. (Laughter)

However, they used a word which I liked. They spoke of the state institutions, and they spoke of the independent institutions. I can easily see how an independent institution, taking very seriously the conception of Dr. Brubacher, wants its freedom maximum and so declares itself. It has indicated precisely what it wants to be, and therefore, in that kind of institution, although it is not state, it is independent, I want that kind of discussion, a discussion that is almost without limit.

I do not think, again, that the Socratic principle necessarily invites this kind of thing. If you read what Socrates said, you will be surprised how biased he was. His bias was in favor of things like justice and so forth, and

his bias was very strong in favor of the Athenian way of life. That is inevitable. The thing that I did is what I like. Let's open it up to argument. Let us have rational discourse, in terms of the freedom that reason necessarily requires. But we must find out what are the initial premises. That is so important, and that was precisely, I think, his own contribution to universities in his training. He tried to bring out from the young men with whom he spoke the tacit and unanalyzed assumptions of their thinking, and discussed these.

Therefore I would certainly agree with you, Dr. Brubacher, that it does not have to be a state institution for a broad discussion of all issues. If an independent institution wants this, it probably would be even more effective than a state institution trying to do the same thing.

DEAN WINBIGLER: I would like to have Professor Brubacher comment on the question of how an institution safeguards itself from involvement in partisan activities on the part of its members. Beginning with your two ground rules, (1) that an educational institution has an obligation to non-partisanship, or impartiality, I believe you used the term, but that its members (students and faculty alike) should have the right to engage in all sorts of advocacy, how does the university safeguard its non-partisan position?

Let me use one example, where a group of professors signed a newspaper advertisement and very prominently identified themselves as professors of x-institution, thereby trading on their institutional identity. This is only one example.

Have you any comment to make about the general question of how an institution maintains its non-partisan position when its members are trading on their institutional identification in the support of partisan causes?

PROFESSOR BRUBACHER: All that I can say is, as I tried to say under ground rule one, that the opposite of it is much worse than the case that you stated. In other words, if the university should take responsibility for what these professors say, I think that then they would be in a much worse situation than if they do not take responsibility. Nonetheless, in an inadvertent, offhand, by-product way this sort of thing happens that you mentioned. In other words, people will read this, and they will think these professors at that institution represent the institution, and there is a certain amount of impairment of the institution that may occur as a result. But this is just one of the risks that we have to run in trying to maintain an impartial university. As I see it, the opposite is worse, and that is the chief comfort I can give you.

DEAN WINBIGLER: Do you think then there is no way then for the institution to protect itself and maintain its non-partisan position, and it just has to accept this?

PROFESSOR BRUBACHER: As I say, the only other way would be if the university would say, all right, before you speak, submit what you have got to say, and if they did that, then once it becomes known that whenever a professor speaks he speaks with the permission of the university, then I think the university is in much worse trouble than it is in the case where the university assumes no responsibility, but someone does talk in the name of the university.

As I say, a certain amount of impairment will happen, but that impairment will not be nearly as great as where the university takes responsibility for what they say.

DEAN WM. R. BUTLER (Ohio University): I would like to follow up this same point. What if a person is under indictment, such as John Gates, former editor of the Daily Worker, was a few years ago, or perhaps the way Jim Hoffa is at the present time, if a student organization would want to invite one of these individuals to the campus? Should they be permitted to speak, using university facilities in the area for which they are under indictment? And in a sense use the university as a platform for discussing their own personal case? I am not clear on this in my own attitude. I would appreciate your comment.

PROFESSOR BRUBACHER: Well, it would seem to me that the thing we are principally after here is some way to maintain the impartiality of the university platform or roster, and I would think in cases like this that what the students would have to do would be to have some way of insuring, we will say, some other point of view or a contrary point of view, or the government's point of view, had an opportunity to be presented at the same time. This would be one way of maintaining the impartiality.

But the mere fact that a person is under indictment -- after all, the case has not been proved one way or another, and I do not see why we should not hear these people, providing this is carried on in an academic atmosphere, really trying to get at the truth of the matter.

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: Incidentally, I would support that last. I think there is a great danger in laying down any general rule about the indictment situation. We have had several examples recently where indictments proved false or trivial, and the universities by such a general rule seem to me to support the climate of fear, if you wish, in not being courageous enough in those matters.

Father Weigel would like to comment on that last question and then I believe, sir, you are next.



REV. WEIGEL: I think there is one thing lacking in our country, which is present in other countries. I am thinking of my own Latin American experience.

There was in society in general a category of a university student, and the man was known as a university student. You did not think so much of the university he was attending, and there would be therefore university student movements which were not identified with any university. You did not think of a particular university at all when this movement manifested itself. In other words, "universitarian" was not merely an expression of belonging to this or that university community. The word also meant that in the classes of society there was a "universitary" class, and therefore, although they identified with this class, they did not identify with an institution.

I think that here we are inclined to identify the universitarian immediately with an institution, rather than with a class, and this is one of the problems, I think, the university has to face.

I think it would be very nice if people, when they signed these protests, said "Professor of Technology" and do not mention the university. Then you do not identify his protest with the university, and the university itself, being impartial, does not want to be identified with that. A rule of that kind would be another ground rule, and might help precisely this situation.

DEAN MacRAE: Yester and the day before we heard from Dr. Hacker and also from Mr. Byse, a distinguished lawyer, that these distinctions between public and private, with respect to the issues that we are discussing here today, are disappearing because the private institutions get government loans, they get grants and aid of various kinds and sorts, they get scholarships for students, and they all get tax exemptions, so is there really the difference which is seemingly indicated in the two discussions here today?

The other question, to Father Weigel, has to do with this university image. Seemingly to me, with this concern for the image, the freedoms are going out the window. On the one hand he says "we must be concerned about this," and on the other hand, the students are supposed to have freedom outside. In the case of a friend of mine, Sam Dorsey, who was quite unconventional but a very good teacher, the President called him in one day. He said, "Dr. Dorsey, I understand that you are inordinately fond of liquor, and that you even believe in free love." Sam said, "Dr. Johnson, it ain't ever free." (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: I think there was a specific question (laughter), and also some observations

about our national love life. (Laughter) I think there was a specific question addressed to you, whether the concern with the image is not one of the very important factors limiting the freedoms that we have been discussing through these three days, and at least at our institution at which I work this is probably the most pressing and troublesome problem of all, the reaction which comes from legislators, trustees, alumni and others, whenever -- well, it is all based on image which appears marred in their mind from certain events that transpire.

REV. WEIGEL: I think it is unfair and against the notion of freedom to go into a store that labels itself very clearly as a Kosher Meat Market, and ask for a pound of pork. I think this is unfair. I think you are restricting the freedom of this particular shop if you insist that it must also sell pork.

On the other hand, I do think that it is most fair that the general laws for the sanitation of meat be applied to that individual meat shop.

Freedom means precisely the exercise of options, and what we ask of freedom is that in its exercise of option it does not deny to someone else a different option. I certainly would give that Kosher meat market those particular benefits that arise for meat markets in general, even though it does not sell pork. I think that it is selling meat, but it is not selling all kinds of meat. And if you are some of the persons who do not want pork, there is no particular curtailing of your freedom by buying there. If you were a person that wants pork, I think you should go to a butcher shop that sells it. But if it sells it, it should not have on the front window the three letters indicating that they sell only Kosher meat.

This is a very homely kind of example, but I think we must defend freedom, and consequently, if we have some people who want to exercise their freedom in terms of curtailment of area, let them, especially if this freedom is exercised by all, each in an option, which is not detrimental whatsoever to the common good. I think this is all healthy. If there is an institution that wants to expand, as I say, make the area of freedom almost limitless, fine, let them do it. If another institution wants to make the area much more circumscribed, fine, let them do it.

I think that in that particular instance, the institution that is using its freedom for the curtailment of area of discussion, or insisting that certain premises begin the argument, it does not in any way violate the principle of freedom. I do not think it even violates the principle of academic freedom. This would be my answer. If the day comes when we have no choice whatsoever in the type of institutions we are going to erect, and that all

must be equivalent, like each other, that is a bad day for our freedom. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: We have only three minutes, and may I suggest that your questions be succinct, or your stories particularly delightful.

DEAN ALAN W. JOHNSON (Houston): Professor Brubacher, you talked about the need for impartiality, and you also talked about our move some 75 years ago through the free elective system. I just wonder if we are now passing, in the extra-curriculum, through the equivalent period to the free elective system period, and whether you might project where we might go from here?

PROFESSOR BRUBACHER: I was just saying that the importation of Lernfreiheit from Germany took the form of the elective curriculum, because I think it was concerned for the German student with academic affairs.

I tried to make the point in the paper that what I think is going on today is an extension, a new phase of Lernfreiheit, the Lernfreiheit now which is much closer to the Lehrfreiheit. And I think this is the projection.

I think that students now, in the claiming of freedom, are wanting to have the same kind of freedom, or the same sort of atmosphere which the professors have had in the past. That is why I tried to sketch their experience as a means of projecting or laying down rules by which the students might control their own further views.

DEAN JOHNSON: Well, we did away with the free elective system.

PROFESSOR BRUBACHER: Not exactly. We did not do away with it. The completely free elective, yes. I think that is true. On the other hand, the freedom came in as a means of protest against the rather rigid type of control which we had had up until that time.

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: A final question.

DEAN TRIPP: It seems to me that you gentlemen exemplify something that I have sensed at our convention this time, and that is in fact that you are kind of variations on Pirandello's "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Professor Weigel has cast us in the role of the silver man and the Platonic model, the administrator with no real wisdom or thought, it seems to me, and Professor Brubacher has not said anything to us about Director Freiheit.

I wonder if you gentlemen would take a minute -- it is a big question at this late point -- to express your

views on the roles of student personnel administrators in connection with the views you have been discussing this morning.

REV. WEIGEL: Because of the absolute universality of the original sin, I think the administrators are necessary. (Laughter and applause)

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: Beautiful! Professor Brubacher, would you like your five seconds on that? (Laughter) No dodge?

PROFESSOR BRUBACHER: I think Father Weigel said it well.

DEAN TRIPP: I do not think Professor Brubacher would accept that answer. Would you accept the doctrine of original sin?

REV. WEIGEL: He would probably call it the Freudian id. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SUMMERSKILL: I think everyone in this room know in his own conscience how much and how little he does to protect and stand up for the rights of our students and our faculty. Among my own colleagues in this work I have great respect for their efforts and their accomplishments in this area, and I think that with particular reference to Professor Hacker's talk, I think that many of the things which he said might better have been addressed to another audience, because consistently in this country, I think it is the Deans of Students, Deans of Men, Deans of Women, who will defend the student, the individual student in times of percussion, in times of great difficulty.

I am in a position, as many of you are, where you are subject to pressures from the outside consistently, and it is no easy job to stand up with courage for the rights of this individual, on the faculty, or the student. I suppose we can pursue this privately after the meeting, and that is it.

The President Elect, Jack Clevenger, has asked the executive committee for the final minutes of this program, of our Forty-Fourth National meeting, to sketch for us the coming developments of the coming year.

Before I turn the platform over to Jack, would you join with me in expressing appreciation to our guests and speakers this morning. (Prolonged applause)

... President Clevenger assumed the Chair ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: John Summerskill, Father Weigel, and Professor Brubacher, truly our deep thanks for

this most stimulating discussion. It has been most enjoyable.

May I ask at this time, is there any further business that should come before the Association in these concluding minutes? If not, then I would like to call on Fred Turner, our Historian, for a brief memorial. Fred.

DEAN TURNER (Memorial Service): President Jack, it has been customary within this Association to take official notice at some time in the session of the passing of any of our former members during the previous year.

From the report of the Secretary, you will note that we have had reported to us six names of former members whose losses had not previously been reported. This appears on page 3 of the Secretary's report. I will read these names, and on two I will make special comment.

Daniel F. Brophy, Dean of Students, City College of New York, whose death occurred on December 15, 1960. That had not been previously reported at an Annual Meeting.

Carl Brett, Dean of Men, University of Texas. His death occurred, as you will remember, just prior, the day before our meeting at Colorado last year.

Arthur Delano Enyart, Dean of Men Emeritus, Rollins College, June 9, 1961. Dean Enyart attended our meetings for many years. He was a highly respected member. He had been retired for approximately ten years, and I believe I am correct that a new and elaborate gymnasium building has been constructed on that campus and named for him.

Paul J. Schofer, Assistant Dean of Men, Ohio University, June 30, 1961.

James W. Armstrong, former Dean of Men, Northwestern University, who died December 19, 1961. He was president of this Association in 1929 and 1930, and published the first News Letter which our Association ever published.

Laurence W. Lange, former Dean of Men, Ohio University, whose death occurred March 3, 1962. Mr. and Mrs. Lange were both in the airplane accident that took so many lives on that date. I might add there that Larry Lange conducted the very valuable study of the Dean of Students' function during war time, which was reported at the Drake Hotel in 1941.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be proper for me to move that this report be accepted, and that the Association rise for a moment in tribute to these men.

... The delegation arose and stood in silent tribute to the memory of the departed NASPA associates ...

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Please be seated.

There were a number of things that I wanted to say to you as the incoming president of this Association. In the interests of time, I think that I would prefer to use the medium of the press to express to you some of the ideas and concerns that I have as your new president.

I want all of you to know how thrilled I have been by the quality of this program at this Forty-Fourth Anniversary Conference, and especially have I been thrilled by the enthusiastic participation of everyone here. I thought a year ago at Colorado Springs that the Colorado Springs meeting topped them all. Now I am going to revise this estimate. Our Philadelphia convention has been tops. We have had a truly wonderful program, and certainly a stimulating one, and rewarding in every way.

I do want to say this to all of you, that I feel very strongly in this: that this Association is not the President's Association, nor is it the property of the Executive Committee, nor is it the property of the Committee on Nominations and Place, nor is it the property of the Commission and Committee Chairmen.

How we go and what we become, and the kind of service we extend to our members and to higher education everywhere depends almost entirely on the kind and the extent of interest and participation by all hands.

It is our fond hope -- it is my fond hope -- that we will have a maximum of shared interests and responsibility as we continue in the operation of this Association.

I think, for instance, that O. D. Roberts, our new Program Chairman, in many ways has the most important job in this Association. It is a big job. He is taking it on for a three year term, and I know I speak for O. D. when I say that he earnestly solicits your ideas and suggestions for our program at Northwestern next June, and for the two years that are to follow while he serves us in this capacity as general program chairman.

This is not just mere talk; this is an earnest request for all of you to make some comments on those blue sheets or to write to O.D. personally about your thoughts about program. This, I insist, is your organization. Help us make it become a more effective Association.

We have seventeen men on the Executive Committee. Ten of them are there because you elected them to office or positions in the Association. We appointed seven men from

the at-large membership. To the best of my ability, as the new president, I tried to insure that these men represented men of interest and experience in this Association, and men who could make a contribution from this standpoint to this entire group.

We then tried, to the best of our ability, to insure that we had adequate representation from small colleges, from large colleges and universities, from public, from private, and from church related institutions. This, I think, we have done. We have done this a bit at the expense of complete geographical distribution, but it was my opinion that these other qualities, these other considerations had to come ahead of a complete geographical distribution of the membership of the Executive Committee. All of us, all of these seventeen men, are here to serve you and serve this Association. Share your ideas with us, please. Many of you have been doing this in the past two and a half days. The better job we do of this, the more effective our organization will become.

We have organized four subcommittees in the Executive Committee, and this will give you some idea of some things we are hoping to report to you next June in Northwestern.

First of all, we have organized a budget committee. This committee will report at the May 13-14 meeting. It has an important job to do. We must adopt our budget for the year at that May meeting. By last night we had a total of \$1600 requested of us for budget support for two committees and one commission. More will probably follow.

It is the obligation of this sub-group, and the obligation of the executive committee to make the best possible use of our total resources, our total income, in furthering the total program of this Association. Thus, we have organized a budget committee to give us leadership in this area.

Furthermore, this budget committee has the job before it of a careful consideration of the scope and program and needs of the Association with the thought that at next June's meeting we may present to you a request for your consideration of increasing the dues, the membership dues in this Association. Now if we do this -- and I assure you this will not be a pie-in-the-sky kind of request -- we will do our best to substantiate the proposal that we have placed before you in terms of the growing needs of our Association. If we do this (I do not think there will be too much question), we are not going to come before you with a request to double the present fee, or to increase it from \$25 to \$35, unless we can be very specific in the manner in which we propose to use this money in furthering the objectives and the program of this Association. This committee has a big assignment.

Mark Smith will head the finance committee.

We have appointed a Publications Committee, headed by Glen Nygreen. The Publications Committee has an important responsibility also. If we follow the previous custom with Leo and Carl, and the publication of the convention proceedings, I think from the content this year we could well go to 600 pages. Can we afford this? Last year our proceedings cost us \$3200. Is it time for us to begin really to give consideration to some changes? Perhaps the organization of a quarterly magazine, if you please, where many of these fine papers and discussions can be presented with other timely news items about the activities of the Association.

Well, we wonder. We propose to study this, and by next June to have some recommendations to present to you. I think we have had some wonderful addresses at this Conference. I think they are the kind of addresses that should be shared among a much wider audience than the immediate membership of our Association. How do we do this? And how do we finance it? This is going to be the responsibility of Glen's subcommittee within the Executive Committee.

We have appointed a subcommittee on the name of the Association, to be headed by Tom Broadbent. There has been much discussion in the hallways and corridors about the name of this Association. Now, as your President, I assure you that I am not going to be a party to rushing into a change of name, for the pure sake of name-changing only. This needs the most careful, the most thoughtful consideration by all of us, everyone in this Association. Tom and his group will be contacting you. Many of you have written to us on this in the past year.

It is my own personal feeling that this does deserve our study because I am afraid that the educational world at large really does not understand what we are about, what we stand for, what our responsibilities are, as they view this title NASPA, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. I, for one, am in favor of giving it most careful consideration, to the possibility of including somewhere within our title the term "Dean" because this is the one term on the campus that our faculty and our students understand.

We are going to give some thought to this, and perhaps we will have some recommendations for your consideration next June.

Finally, we have appointed a subcommittee that, for lack of a better term -- I think I picked this up from Fred -- we have called the Committee on the Secretary. By next June we will have 400 member institutions in this organization. If we are not already at the point, I think



we are soon arriving at the point when we as a matter of good conscience can no longer expect Carl Knox to take all the time that he must presently take away from his family, on evenings, on his Saturdays and Sundays, in serving as the Secretary-Treasurer of this organization. That day may already be here. He has been a devoted servant, and we are proud of him for it. But I think our conscience should begin to bother us just a bit on this.

We are far from through in terms of growth in membership in this organization. I think we must give some thought to the establishment of a central office, with at least a start on the part time paid staff, to do some of the work that we have previously assigned to Carl and before him to Fred Turner.

To head this subcommittee in our Executive Committee, I have asked Fred Turner to serve in this respect.

This will give you some idea of the concern that we have. There are many other things. What this Association becomes, the contribution it makes to higher education will be determined in part by some of the things that Commission I does. I could point out many others. Jim McLeod's Committee on Membership is awfully important to the future of the Association. But enough on this, of singling out.

I encourage your interest, your suggestions, your letters. I encourage as full a communication as is possible for us to have as we carry on the work of our Association.

Finally, I think it is awfully important, as we conclude this Conference to record our expression of gratitude to Glen Nygreen for this fine Conference, and the leadership that he has given us in these three years. Glen, this has been a fine Conference, sir, and we appreciate what you have done. Will you stand? (Applause)

To Carl Grip -- Carl, you and the other men in our Association from this area have done a tremendous job for us and we are deeply appreciative. Last night you were referred to the men who are listed on page 5, and I would like to refer to it again, and to Carl particularly, and to Dick Solomon, to George Letchworth, to Bob Crane, to Dudley Jencks, to Ray Whittaker, and incidentally, Ray Whittaker and a TV crew waits outside to do a TV broadcast on our actions this morning, on our resolutions on the federal scholarship proposal. We have had wonderful press coverage. Ray, we are grateful to you. To Bob Longley, to Bill Toombs, to all of these men, our deep feelings of gratitude for the way you have hosted this convention and helped to make it the success that it has been.

Finally, to all of these men, these wonderful

speakers, the fine discussions, the leadership that so many of you have provided in these past -- well, starting with Sunday noon -- few days, how do you say "thank you" with the depth of sincerity that all of us feel? I hope very much that you recognize it and feel it. One of the fine things about this Association is the fellowships, the friendships, and the depth of feeling that we have about the men in our Association, and their commitment to all of us.

I bring this Forty-Fourth Annual Association Meeting to adjournment with this benediction:

God be with you! (Applause)

... The Forty-fourth Anniversary Conference adjourned at twelve-five o'clock ...

---

## APPENDIX A

### REPORT OF THE SECRETARY April 1, 1961 - April 1, 1962

This report of secretarial activities of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators extends from the Forty-Third Annual Conference in Colorado Springs, Colorado to the Forty-Fourth Conference in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. As one of the highlights of the past year, the membership of the Association should be noted.

#### ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

10 years ago	Total Members	(1952)	214
5 years ago	Total Members	(1957)	281
Last Year	Total Members	(1961)	344

Members added since 4/1/61	23
Members dropped since 4/1/61	1

TOTAL MEMBERSHIP AS OF APRIL 1, 1962	<u>366</u>
(Membership inquiries pending) . . . . .	15

Added interest in the Association, activities and efforts of our NASPA membership committee, and the personal assistance of our current members account for this added growth.

#### NEW MEMBERS SINCE THE COLORADO CONVENTION - APRIL 1, 1961

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Representative</u>
Alameda County State College	Hayward, Calif.	Dr. Harry A. Grace
Carroll College	Waukesha, Wis.	Robert E. Matson
Culver-Stockton	Canton, Mo.	H. Dale Almond
Dayton, Univ. of	Dayton, Ohio	George S. Barrett, S.M.
Eastern New Mexico University	Portales, N.M.	Darold Shutt
Elmhurst College	Elmhurst, Ill.	William F. Denman
Fairleigh Dickinson University	Rutherford, N.J.	Clair W. Black
Gonzaga University	Spokane, Wash.	Daniel Lyons, S.J.
Hofstra College	Hempstead, N.Y.	Randall W. Hoffman
Hope College	Holland, Mich.	James Harvey

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Representative</u>
LeMoyne College	Syracuse, N. Y.	Robert E. Butler, S.J.
Loyola University of Chicago	Chicago, Ill.	H. McCloskey
Lycoming College	Williamsport, Pa.	Jack C. Buckle
MacMurray College	Jacksonville, Ill.	David E. Long
Manhattan College	New York, N.Y.	George T. Eastment
Occidental College	Los Angeles, Calif.	Robert S. Ryf
Pomona College	Claremont, Calif.	Shelton L. Beaty
Richmond, Univ. of	Richmond, Va.	C. J. Gray
Shepherd College	Shepherdstown, W. Va.	Ormsby L. Harry
Simpson College	Indianola, Iowa	Joseph W. Walt
The Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science & Art	New York, N.Y.	Dr. Richard S. Ball
Wabash College	Crawfordsville, Ind.	Norman C. Moore

#### MEMBERSHIP DISCONTINUED

St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota

The following participants in NASPA and NADAM have passed away since our last meeting. To appropriately describe the loss of these men is a task beyond the abilities of this reporter. Suffice it is to say, that the Association deeply regrets to report the following.

#### DEATHS OF NASPA PARTICIPANTS

Daniel F. Brophy, Dean of Students, City College of New York, December 15, 1960 (Not previously reported).

Carl Brett, Dean of Men, University of Texas (Just prior to the Colorado Conference).

Arthur Delano Enyart, Dean of Men Emeritus, Rollins College, June 9, 1961.

Paul J. Schofer, Assistant Dean of Men, Ohio University, June 30, 1961.

James W. Armstrong, Former Dean of Men, Northwestern University, December 19, 1961.

Laurence W. Lange, Former Dean of Men, Ohio University,  
March 3, 1962.

Officially, and unofficially, NASPA has been represented at many different conferences and meetings of other National and Regional Associations. In words of the late Dean Christian Gauss, back in 1938, "The public speaks of professors as occupying chairs. Now that may be all right for professors, but it will never do for Deans. If you are a Dean, you must stir around."

#### N.A.S.P.A. REPRESENTATION

American Council on Education  
American National Red Cross -- National Advisory Committee  
for Colleges and Universities  
American College Personnel Association  
Association of College Honor Societies  
Association of College and University Housing Officials  
Association for the Coordination of University Religious  
Affairs  
Fraternity Scholarship Association  
Inter-Association Coordinating Committee  
Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council  
National Association of College Unions  
National Association of Foreign Student Advisers  
National Association of Women Deans and Counselors  
National Interfraternity Conference  
Omicron Delta Kappa  
Regional Meetings -- Phi Eta Sigma  
United States National Student Association  
Various Inaugurations and Celebrations  
Western Personnel Conference

Regional meetings have been reported by means of the Newsletter. Fixed relationships to NASPA have never been established and a future development for the Association might be the strengthening of regional and state ties.

#### REGIONAL MEETINGS REPORTED

Allerton Conference of Mid-West Deans of Students  
Illinois Deans and Advisers of Men  
New England Regional Deans  
Ohio Association of Student Personnel Administrators  
Pennsylvania Association of Student Personnel Administrators  
Southern Association of Deans of Men

Publications of NASPA help to bind the organization together. Proceedings of the 43rd Anniversary Conference at Colorado Springs were reproduced and distributed to all conference registrants, institutional representatives, and library subscribers. This 358 page report is a continuance of the series of complete coverages of every annual meeting of NASPA and its predecessor, NADAM.

Six issues of the BREEZE (NASPA Newsletter) have been mailed to all member institutions since the last conference. Included with these informal bulletins, have been three brochures published by the American Red Cross, two publications concerning legal relationships, several book reviews, digests of several student personnel papers, and other items of interest to members of the Association.

A new publication entitled, "Yearbook of Student Personnel and Related Organizations in Colleges and Universities" was authored by former Executive Dean William S. Guthrie (Ohio State) and Dean Kenneth R. Venderbush (Lawrence) for NASPA. Copies were distributed to all NASPA institutional representatives, to the Presidents of all associations and organizations named therein, and to other interested representatives. Very favorable comments have been indicated to this reporter and to the Chairman of NASPA Commission I on Professional Relationships concerning the desirability of the continuance of this project.

Evidence of special Committee work should be three self-explanatory NASPA Brochures within the near future. The Committee on Consulting Services may have a small mailing folder descriptive of its available personnel at Philadelphia. An attractive statement concerning NASPA is being prepared by the Membership Committee, while a Career Folder on Student Personnel Work is in the hopper as prepared by last year's Commission III on the Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators. Such results are indicative of the increased effectiveness of our working Committees and Commissions.

Our Placement Officer, Dean Arno Nowotny, has prepared fifty-nine placement profiles which have been distributed with copies of the newsletter. Written communications and telephone calls have been exchanged regularly between Austin, Texas and Urbana, Illinois concerning this important service. Excellent facilities for this important service have been promised for Dean Nowotny, his committee members, and registrants at the Philadelphia Conference.

#### YOUR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President Fred Weaver, your NASPA Officers, and other members of the Executive Committee have met three times in Chicago, Illinois -- on May 15, 1961; October 23, 1961; and February 12, 1962. In conjunction with the last meeting, Dean Ed Williamson and his Commission VIII members met concerning "Student Discussion and Action on Social Issues." Results and future plans emanating from this session will be shared at the Philadelphia meeting.

Minutes of each Executive Committee Meeting are on file. Some of the highlights might be cited as follows:

1. Planning for the Annual Conference was covered at each meeting.

2. A sub-committee was formed to study:

- a. The Name of the Association
- b. Future role and function
- c. Secretariat and placement service
- d. Journal or Quarterly Publication

3. Committee on Consulting Services authorized to publish a folder concerning its availability.

4. Publication and distribution of Guthrie-Venderbush "Yearbook of Student Personnel and Related Organizations In Colleges and Universities" was authorized.

5. A brochure concerning NASPA to be sent to prospective members has been authorized.

6. A study proposal by Commission VIII on, "The Student and Social Issues" has been approved by the Executive. Authorization has been given on behalf of NASPA to seek foundation financial support.

7. It has been agreed that Reports of Commissions and Committees would be prepared and circulated throughout the Conference in so far as possible.

#### CONCLUSION

My fourth year as Secretary-Treasurer of this Association has been rewarding from the standpoint of associations with fellow deans all over the country, and frustrating from the realization of not doing many things which should have been done. The officers and members of the Executive Committee have been extremely helpful and I am very appreciative of the secretarial assistance of Miss Marilyn Smith since September of 1961.

All National Association of Student Personnel Administrators participants are invited to submit comments, criticisms, and suggestions to the Secretary-Treasurer at any time. Strength and improvement of the organization depend upon a broad base of active participation.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl W. Knox  
Secretary-Treasurer

3/26/62

TREASURER'S REPORT  
March 17, 1961, through March 22, 1962

RECEIPTS

Balance on Hand, March 17, 1961	8086.49	
1961 Conference Receipts	5974.22	
Dues Received	8400.00	
Sale of Proceedings	39.00	
Misc. Receipts	<u>58.50</u>	
Balance on Hand & Total Receipts		22,558.21

DISBURSEMENTS

Annual Conference Expense:

1961 Conference Expense	4962.82
Cost of Proceedings	3247.51
Conference Chairman	1000.00
Badges	<u>85.36</u>
Total Conference Expense	9295.69

Secretary-Treasurer's Expense:

Printing & Mimeographing	170.62
Postage	731.06
Telephone & Telegraph	29.95
Stenographic Service	581.65
Books & Magazines	1.62
Secretary's Allotment	100.00
Misc.	<u>29.02</u>
Total Sec.-Treas. Expense	1643.92

Executive Committee Expenses:

President's Fund	300.00
Meeting Expenses	2598.02
Commission & Committee Ex.	<u>814.60</u>
Total Exec.Com. Expense	3712.62

Misc. Expenses:

American Council Dues	50.00
Misc. Expenses	<u>52.00</u>
Total Misc. Expenses	102.00

Total Disbursements 14,754.23

ENDING BALANCE, MARCH 22, 1962 \$7,803.98

Balance/check book, 3-22-62	7,803.98
Balance/NASPA records 3/22/62	7,803.98
Balance/bank statement 3/22/62	7,803.98



## APPENDIX B

1 9 6 2

### CONFERENCE OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

Conference Chairman  
Dean Glen T. Nygreen  
Kent State University

Registration Secretary  
Miss Marilyn Smith  
University of Illinois

Conference Reporter  
Mr. Leo Isen  
Chicago, Illinois

### COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND PLACE

(Made up of all Past Presidents in attendance, plus three members elected by the Association. The senior Past President present serves as the Chairman)

Dean Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin, 1919 (1),  
1928 (10)  
Dean W. E. Alderman, Miami University, 1936 (18)  
President D. S. Lancaster, Longwood College, 1937 (19)  
Vice President D. H. Gardner, University of Akron, 1938 (20),  
1939 (21)  
Vice President J. J. Thompson, St. Olaf College, 1941 (23)  
Vice President J. H. Julian, University of South Dakota,  
1944 (26)  
Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas, 1947 (29)  
Dean E. C. Cloyd, North Carolina State College, 1948 (30)  
Dean J. H. Newman, University of Alabama, 1949 (31)  
Dean L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College, 1950 (32)  
Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University, 1951 (33)  
President A. Blair Knapp, Denison University, 1952 (34)  
President Victor F. Spathelf, Ferris Institute, 1953 (35)  
Dean John H. Stibbs, Tulane University, 1955 (37)  
Dean John E. Hocutt, University of Delaware, 1956 (38)  
Secretary Frank C. Baldwin, Cornell University, 1957 (39)  
Dean Donald M. DuShane, University of Oregon, 1958 (40)  
Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois 1959 (41)  
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University, 1960 (42)  
William S. Guthrie, formerly Ohio State University, 1961 (43)

### Elected Members and Alternates

Dean Robert F. Etheridge, Miami University  
Dean David L. Harris, Ripon College  
Dean M. L. Huit, University of Iowa  
Dean P. H. Ratterman, S. J., Xavier University  
Dean Mark Smith, Denison University  
Dean Theodore Zillman, University of Wisconsin

## THE CONTINUING COMMITTEES

### Committee on Consulting Services

This committee is to inventory the consulting resources on student personnel problems available from members of the Association. It will also recommend procedures by which these services may be made available to member institutions and others interested.

Dean John H. Stibbs, Chairman, Tulane University  
Dean Clifford J. Craven, University of Oklahoma  
Dean John E. Hocutt, University of Delaware  
Dean Juan Reid, Colorado College  
Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois  
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University  
Dean Ralph A. Young, College of Wooster

### Representatives to American Institute of Architects

Dean Robert C. Goodridge, Liaison Representative,  
University of Redlands  
Dean Thomas E. Baker, Alternate, Case Institute of  
Technology

### Representative to Association of College and University Housing Officers

Dean Arthur Kiendl, Liaison Representative, University  
of Colorado

### Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations

A standing committee with the function of maintaining the Association's relationships with all national student organizations. It advises on problems and opportunities involving these organizations with NASPA and its member institutions.

Dean Ray Hawk, Chairman, University of Oregon  
Dean William E. Toombs, Vice Chairman, Drexel Institute  
of Technology  
Dean Walter S. Blake, Jr., Willamette University  
Dean Earle W. Clifford, Syracuse University  
Dean Burns B. Crookston, University of Utah  
Dean James E. Foy, Auburn University  
Dean John Gillis, Illinois State Normal University  
Professor Gordon Klopff, Columbia University  
Dean Charles W. McCracken, Trenton State College

### Committee on Fraternity Relations

A standing committee to develop programs, to provide information to NASPA, and to maintain relations with others concerning fraternity matters. It offers judgment on moral correctness, educational soundness, and political feasibility of programs in order to aid NASPA to fulfill its responsibilities to its member institutions and to higher education.

Dean Donald M. DuShane, Chairman, University of Oregon  
Dean Harold E. Angelo, University of Colorado  
Dean Ben E. David, University of Miami  
Director Richard L. Hansford, University of Akron  
Mr. Raymond C. King, Columbia University  
Dean Charles Lewis, University of North Dakota  
Dean Donald R. Mallett, Purdue University  
Dean William R. Nester, University of Cincinnati  
Dean Ronald W. Roskens, Kent State University  
Dean William Tate, University of Georgia  
Dean Ralph W. Wright, Kansas State College of Pittsburg

### Committee on International Exchange of Students

A committee to prepare recommendations for a NASPA policy statement concerning the aims and operations of foreign student programs on the American campus, and of study programs abroad for American students, with special reference to the responsibilities of student personnel administration in these areas. This committee considers new and proposed government programs and recommends positions and action to NASPA.

Dean John B. Netherton, Chairman, University of Chicago  
Dean Donald K. Alderson, Vice Chairman, University of Kansas  
Dean Donald K. Anderson, University of Washington  
Dean William V. Burger, Colorado School of Mines  
Dean Millard R. Krathochvil, Iowa State University  
Dean H. Carroll Parish, University of California at Los Angeles  
Dean Walter B. Rea, University of Michigan  
Director Stanley D. Weinstein, Brandeis University

### Committee on Membership

A committee to make recommendations to the Association on membership policy and to conduct a selective campaign of membership solicitation among eligible institutions.

Dean James C. McLeod, Chairman, Northwestern University  
Dean James G. Allen, Texas Technological College  
Dean John L. Blackburn, University of Alabama  
Dean William D'O. Lippincott, Princeton University

Dean Donald M. DuShane, University of Oregon  
Dean Lester L. Hale, University of Florida  
Dean M. L. Huit, State University of Iowa  
Dean Arthur Kiendl, University of Colorado  
Dean Frank J. Simes, Pennsylvania State University  
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University

#### Committee on Placement

A committee to assist the Placement Officer in providing an effective placement service for members of the Association for other qualified persons seeking positions in the student personnel field. Committee members assist the Placement Officer at the annual Conference and, during the year, act as regional representatives of the Association in placement activities.

Dean Arno Nowotny, Chairman, University of Texas  
Dean Ben E. David, University of Miami  
Director Richard L. Hansford, University of Akron  
Dean Ray Hawk, University of Oregon  
Dean Richard E. Hulet, Illinois State Normal University  
Dean Donald A. Kluge, Eastern Illinois University  
Dean Carlton L. Krathwohl, Syracuse University  
Dean James J. Stewart, Jr., North Carolina State College  
Dean James E. Williamson, University of Houston

#### THE COMMISSIONS

##### Commission I Professional Relations

The functional relationships between NASPA and the numerous agencies distributed through the organization of higher education whose interests touch those of student personnel administration are the concern of this commission. The commission has taken an important part in the development of the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee composed of representatives of NASPA, NAWDC, ACPA, AACRAO, and ACHUO.

Dean J. C. Clevenger, Chairman, Washington State  
University  
Dean Stanley C. Benz, San Jose State College  
Dean J. Gordon Brown, Emory and Henry College  
Dean William G. Craig, Stanford University  
Dean Patricia Cross, Cornell University  
Assistant Director A. Lincoln Fisch, Center for the  
Study of Higher Education, Ann Arbor, Michigan  
Dean Richard E. Hulet, Illinois State Normal University  
Dean Mylin H. Ross, Ohio State University  
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University

Commission II  
Professional and Legal Principles and Problems

Two assignments have been given to this commission. One is to review and revise periodically the "Statement of Principles and Professional Ethics" printed in this program. The second is to study the legal problems which confront student personnel administrators, to review the statutes of the several states which afford protection to the counselor and student personnel administrator, and to advise on institutional policies which guide officers in the discharge of their legal duties.

Dean John E. Hocutt, Chairman, University of Delaware  
Dean Francis C. Bourbon, S.J., Loyola College (Baltimore)  
Dean Thomas L. Broadbent, University of California at  
Riverside  
Assistant Dean Charles Gambs, Ohio State University  
Dean John P. Gwin, Beloit College  
Dean Jack Matthews, University of Missouri  
Dean Ben L. Perry, Jr., Florida A. & M. University  
Dean Patrick H. Ratterman, S. J., Xavier University  
Dean Weldon P. Shofstall, Arizona State University  
Vice Dean Louis Toepfer, Law School of Harvard University

Commission III  
Development and Training of Student  
Personnel Administrators

The recruitment, development, and training of student personnel administrators is the overall concern of this commission. Current projects include the preparation of publishable materials and cooperation with other associations in the designing of study and training programs.

Dean Robert Shaffer, Chairman, Indiana University  
Dean Donald K. Alderson, University of Kansas  
Dean James G. Allen, Texas Technological College  
Director Kenneth M. Collier, Ball State Teachers College  
Associate Dean Robert Crane, University of Illinois  
Dean Thomas A. Emmet, University of Detroit  
Dean Robert F. Etheridge, Miami University  
Assistant Dean J. Donald Marsh, Wayne State University  
Dean Charles McCracken, Trenton State College  
Dean C. Milton Pike, Jr., Northern Illinois University  
Dean Vinton Rambo, Shippensburg State College  
Associate Dean George B. Spitz, Jr., Queens College  
Dean Louis C. Stamatokos, University of Wisconsin at  
Dean Herbert J. Wunderlich, Kansas State University

Commission IV  
Program and Practices Evaluation

This commission serves as a clearing house for information and literature dealing with evaluation of student personnel work. Its interests include the study of existing evaluative devices and encouraging research on such devices in areas of student personnel work where they are most needed.

Dean Carlton L. Krathwohl, Chairman, Syracuse University  
Dean Shelton B. Beatty, Pomona College  
Director James F. Carr, Jr., Florida State University  
Dean Clifford J. Craven, University of Oklahoma  
Dean Marion L. Huit, State University of Iowa  
Professor Clarence A. Mahler, Chico State College  
Dean Harry L. McCloskey, Loyola University (Chicago)  
Dean J. Towner Smith, Western Michigan University  
Dean Philip A. Tripp, Washburn University  
Dean Laurence C. Woodruff, University of Kansas

Commission V  
Relationships with the Behavioral Sciences

The strengthening of relationships between student personnel administration and research and teaching activities in the behavioral sciences is the purpose of this commission. It is concerned both with relationships between professional persons in terms of attitudes and perceptions and with relationships between the work of the student personnel administrator and the knowledge and contributions of the behavioral scientist.

Dean Mark W. Smith, Chairman, Denison University  
Associate Dean John W. Alexander, Columbia College  
Dean Peter Armacost, Augsburg College  
Dean Earle W. Clifford, Syracuse University  
Dean James W. Dean, Virginia Polytechnic Institute  
Dean Lester L. Hale, University of Florida  
Dean David L. Harris, Ripon College  
Dean S. Joseph House, Newark College of Engineering  
Dean Glen T. Nygreen, Kent State University  
Dean Lawrence A. Riggs, DePauw University  
Director Gary R. Schwartz, Mankato State College  
Dean Richard Siggelkow, University of Buffalo  
Dean Laurence C. Smith, Texas Christian University  
Dean William E. Toombs, Drexel Institute of Technology

Commission VI  
Student Financial Aids

Its purpose is to analyze national trends in the providing of financial assistance to college students. It is to formulate an expression of the Association's views after a review

of studies and a gathering of opinion from member institutions.

Dean Carl M. Grip, Chairman, Temple University  
Dean Armour J. Blackburn, Howard University  
Dean Paul A. Bloland, Drake University  
Dean I. Clark Davis, Southern Illinois University  
Dean Arno J. Haack, Washington University  
Dean Noble B. Hendrix, University of Miami  
Assistant Director William Knapp, Wayne State University  
Dean O. William Lacy, Trinity College  
Dean LeRoy E. Luberg, University of Wisconsin  
Dean George L. Playe, University of Chicago  
Dean George H. Watson, Roosevelt University

#### Commission VII Religious Activities

This commission is concerned with the changing pattern of religious expressions on campus under the conflicting pressures of a pluralistic society. It also studies the developing relationships among student religious organizations and represents the views of the Association in the councils of these groups.

Director Joseph C. Gluck, Chairman, West Virginia University  
Coordinator DeWitt C. Baldwin, University of Michigan  
Dean Floyd E. Bowling, Tennessee Wesleyan College  
Dean Allen C. Brooks, The Principia College  
Dean Stuart Good, Cornell College Iowa  
Dean Alfred J. Kilp, S.J., Loyola University of Los Angeles  
Dean W. Mayne Longnecker, Southern Methodist University  
Director Milton Mclean, Ohio State University  
Dean Lyle G. Reynolds, University of California at Santa Barbara  
Vice President Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., Fordham Univ.

#### Commission VIII The Student and Social Issues

A commission to study and appraise the responsibilities of student personnel administrators in connection with student discussion and action upon social issues.

Dean E. G. Williamson, Chairman, University of Minnesota  
Dean Donald K. Anderson, University of Washington  
Dean Armour J. Blackburn, Howard University  
Dean Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J., Xavier University  
Dean Walter B. Rea, University of Michigan  
Dean David W. Robinson, Emory University  
Dean W. L. Swartzbaugh, Amherst College  
Dean O. W. Lacy, Trinity College

Inter-Association Coordinating Committee  
1961 - 62

An informal group of representatives from five student personnel professional associations:

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions  
Officers (AACRAO)  
American College Personnel Association (ACPA)  
Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO)  
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators  
(NASPA)  
National Association of Women Deans and Counselors (NAWDC)

NASPA Representatives

Dean J. C. Clevenger, Washington State University,  
Chairman, NASPA Commission I, President-designate  
William S. Guthrie, formerly Ohio State University,  
NASPA Past-President  
Secretary Fred H. Weaver, University of North Carolina,  
NASPA President  
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University, NASPA  
Past President

To Committee on Professional Preparation and Education of  
Student Personnel Workers:

Dean Robert Shaffer, Indiana University

To Committee on Relationships with Academic Deans and  
Administrative Officers:

Dean James McLeod, Northwestern University

To Committee on Relationships with Regional Accrediting  
Agencies with Reference to Student Services:

Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University

To Committee on Relationships with Research Centers for  
Higher Education:

Counselor Dirck W. Brown, State University of Iowa

NASPA ANNUAL CONFERENCE DATES

1963 -- June 24-27, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.  
Host Dean - James C. McLeod, Northwestern University  
1964 -- April 1-4, Detroit Michigan  
Host Dean - Harold E. Stewart, Wayne State University  
1965 -- Early April, Washington, D. C.  
Host Dean - Armour J. Blackburn, Howard University  
1966 -- Late June, Seattle, Washington  
Host Dean - Donald K. Anderson, University of Wash.



# APPENDIX C

## ATTENDANCE FORTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Adams, Frank T.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Florida
Adler, Steven A.	Dean of Stu.Aff.	Penn State
Alexander, John W.	Assoc. Dean	Columbia Univ.
Allen, James G.	Dean of Stu.Life	Texas Tech. Col.
Almli, Mark H.	Dean of Men	St. Olaf College
Anderson, Donald K.	Dean of Students	Univ.of Washington
Armacost, Peter H.	Dean of Students	Augsburg College
Atwood, Edward C., Jr.		Washington & Lee
Babbitt, Samuel F.		Peace Corps
Bailey, Kenneth M.	Dean of Stu.Aff.	Penn State
Baker, Thomas E.	Dean of Students	Case Inst.of Tech.
Baldwin, Dewitt C.	Coordinator of Religious Affairs	Univ. of Michigan
Baldwin, Frank C.	Secy. of Univ.	Cornell Univ.
Ball, Richard S.	Dean of Students	Cooper Union
Banaghan, Wm. F.	Sup.Student Aff.	South. Illinois
Barber, George S.		Park College
Barnes, Ronald E.	Asst.Dir.Stu.Aff.	Iowa State Univ.
Barrett, George B.,Rev.	Vice President	Univ. of Dayton
Basta, Sam M.	Dean Stu. Affairs	Univ. of Nevada
Baumgart, Norbert K.	Dean of Students	Wilmington College
*Beard, Norman E.	Dir.Student Af.	Anderson College
Beatty, Shelton L.	Dean of Men	Pomona College
Beavers, Allen L., Jr.	Asst.to Dean Men	Boston University
Beer, Ronald S.	Asst.Dean of Men	Kent State Univ.
Bishop, Phil A.	Student	Boston University
Bishop, Robert W.	Dean,Summer School	Univ. of Cincinnati
Bitner, Harold M.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Hawaii
Blackburn, Armour J.	Dean of Students	Howard University
Blackburn, John L.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Alabama
Black, Clair W.	Dean of Rutherford	Fairleigh Dickinson
Blake, Walter	Dean of Students	Willamette Univ.
Bloch, Wheadon	Dean of Students	Univ. Kansas City
Bloland, Paul A.	Dean of Students	Drake University
Boggs, Robert L.	Dean of Students	Loyola University
Bolyard, Wm. T.	Dir.Stu.Affairs	Westminster College
Boocock, Cornelius B.	Dean of Men	Rutgers
Borreson, B. J.	Exec.Dean Stu.Life	Univ. of Maryland
Bouffard, Jean C.	Dean of Students	Laval University
Bourbon, Frank C.,S.J.	Dean of Men	Loyola College
Boutwell, Sidney F.	Dean of Men	Vanderbilt Univ.
Bowes, Harry	Dir. Barton Hall	Ill.St.Normal Univ.
Bowling, Floyd	Dean of Students	Tenn.Wesleyan Col.
Bretz, Frank H.	Dean of Students	Lenoir Rhyne Col.
Brewer, Warren	Asst. Dean of Men	Vanderbilt Univ.
Broadbent, Thomas L.	Dean of Students	Univ.Cal.(Riverside)
Brooks, Allen C.	Dean of Men	Principia College

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Brown, C. W.	Asst. Dean of Men	Purdue University
Brown, Dirck W.	Counselor to Men	St. Univ. of Iowa
Brown, J. Gordon	Dean of Men	Emory & Henry Col.
Brown, Paul L.	Dean of Men	St. Univ. of New York
Brugger, Adolph T.	Dean of Men	U.C.L.A.
Buckle, Jack C.	Dean of Students	Lycoming College
Buckner, Donald R.	Asst. Dir. Stu. Pers.	Georgetown Univ.
Burkhardt, Wm. H.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Mass.
Burns, Ralph F.	Exec. Secretary	Alpha Sigma Frat.
Burns, Richard L.	Grad. Student	Purdue University
Butler, Robt. E., S. J.	Dean of Men	Le Moyne College
Butler, Wm. R.	Dean of Men	Ohio University
Caister, Louis E.	Dean of Students	Malone College
Camercon, Alexander R.	Assoc. Dean of Men	Univ. of Rochester
Campbell, Clarence B.	Assoc. Dean of Stu.	Lehigh University
Campbell, Merle E.	Dean of Stu. Aff.	Penn State
Campbell, Phillip R.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Miami
Cecil, Carl E.	Dean of Men	Waynesburg College
Chambers, Lorenzo H.	Dean of Stu. Aff.	Penn State
Cheney, K. Wm.	Dean of Students	Springfield College
Chronister, Jay L.	Asst. Dean Stu. Af.	Penn State
*Clevenger, Jack C.	Dean of Students	Washington St. Univ.
Clifford, Earle W.	Dean of Men	Syracuse Univ.
Cole, Joseph W.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Rochester
Collier, Kenneth M.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Ball State Teach. Col.
Connole, Paul H.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Washington University
Cornelius, Fran Jay	Grad. Hse. Fellow	Bucknell University
Corson, Louis D.	Director	Retired Prof. Reg.
Crafts, Wm. G.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Pittsburgh
Craven, Clifford J.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Oklahoma
*Crews, Don W.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Florida Sou. College
Crookston, Burns B.	Assoc. Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Utah
Cross, K. Patricia	Dean of Students	Cornell Univ.
Coutts, Alan	Dean of Men	Dickinson College
Daniel, Ralph D.	Exec. Secy.	Phi Kappa Psi Frat.
Daniels, Stewart D.	Exec. Secy.	Alpha Tau Omega
David, Ben E.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Miami
David, Wm. M.	Dean of Men	Western Md. Col.
Davis, I. Clark	Dir. Stu. Affairs	Sou. Illinois Univ.
Davis, Howard	Dir. Stu. Affairs	Sou. Illinois Univ.
*Deakins, Clarence E.	Chief, Field Oper.	U.S. Office of Educ.
Dean, James W.	Dean, Stu. Affairs	Vir. Poly. Institute
Deberry, Herbert W.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	St. Univ. of New York
Debolt, Edgar C.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Upsala College
Decker, Robert J.	Assoc. Dir. Stu. Per.	Univ. So. Florida
Delcamp, Sam L.	Head Resident	Taylor University
Demarr, Frederick S.	Dean of Students	C.W. Post College
Denman, William F.	Dean of Students	Elmhurst College
Depuy, Hadley S.	Dean of Students	Franklin & Marshall
Dey, Charles F.	Asst. Dean of Col.	Dartmouth College
*Dierolf, Claude E.	Dean of Men	Muhlenberg College

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Distasio, Patrick J.	Res. Instructor	Univ. of So. Fla.
Donahue, Timothy S.	Dir. Res. Personnel	Clarkson Col. of Tech.
*Dull, James E.	Assoc. Dean of Stu.	Georgia Tech.
*Dushane, Donald M.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Oregon
Dux, Henry A.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Rhode Is.
Eastment, George T.		Manhattan
Edwards, Thomas J.	Dean of Students	Kenyon College
Eldred, Donald R.	Dean of Students	Illinois College
Emmet, Thomas A.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Detroit
England, Kenneth M.	Dean of Men	Georgia St. College
Etheridge, Robert F.	Dean of Students	Miami University
Eycke, Carl O.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Vermont
Farricker, Wm. J.	Dean of Men	Fordham Univ.
Federer, Wm. J., S. J.	Dean of Men	St. Louis Univ.
Ferber, Daniel A.	Assoc. Dir. Res. Hl.	Indiana University
Field, William F.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Mass.
Florestano, Thomas E.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Maryland
Forbes, Thomas R., Jr.	Grad. Student	Harvard Bus. School
Foy, James E.	Dean of Stu. Aff.	Auburn University
Fox, James W.	Dir. of Housing	Univ. of Akron
French, Arden O.	Dean of Men	Louisiana St. Univ.
Flynn, Magnus S. G.	Asst. Dean Stu. Aff.	Sir Geo. Williams U.
Fuzak, John A.	Dean of Students	Michigan St. Univ.
*Gadaire, Charles R.	Dean of Students	Amer. Intrnatl. Col.
Galbraith, Maurie J.	Dean Stu. Affairs	Univ. Illinois (Chi.)
Gambs, Charles R., Jr.	Assoc. Dean	Ohio State Univ.
Garcia-Bottari, Rafael E.	Dean of Students	Univ. Puerto Rico
Gardiner, Robb G.	Assoc. Dean of Stu.	Univ. New Hampshire
Gavin, Paul (Bro.)	V. P. / Stu. Affairs	LaSalle College
Gentry, Robert F.	Asst. Head Couns.	Indiana Univ.
Gillis, John	Asst. Dean of Men	Ill. St. Normal Univ.
Gluck, Joseph C.	Dir. Stu. Affairs	West Va. Univ.
Good, Stuart	Dean Stu. Affairs	Cornell College
Goodridge, Robt. C.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Redlands
Gordon, Arthus E., S. J.	Dir. Stu. Personnel	Georgetown Univ.
Greenberger, Paul D.	Counselor	Kent State Univ.
Greene, Porter C.	Dean of Men	Keystone Jr. Col.
Griffeth, Paul L.	Dean of Students	Western Mich. Univ.
Griffin, Russell A.	Dean of Students	Western Res. Univ.
Griffith, Wm. F.	Dean of Students	Colgate University
*Grip, Carl M.	Dean of Men	Temple University
Guthrie, Wm. S.	Past President of NASPA	36 East Gay St. Columbus 15, Ohio
Gwin, John P.	Dean of Students	Beloit College
Hachet, Ronald A.	Frat. Assistant	Ball St. Teach. Col.
Haefner, Donald A.	Res. Hall Dir.	Ball St. Teach. Col.
Hafer, John S.	Dean Per. Adm.	Syracuse Univ.
Hannigan, James P.	Dean of Students	A&M Col. of Texas
Hansford, Richard L.	Dir. Stu. Per.	Univ. of Akron

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
*Hanson, Ernest E.	V.P. Stu.Per.	Northern Ill. Univ.
Hardy, Donald P.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Delaware
Harris, David L.	Dean of Men	Ripon College
Harrod, Ira E.	Dean of Students	Rensselaer Poly.Inst.
Harrold, Roger D.	Research Asst.D/S	Ohio State Univ.
Hartnett, Rod T.	Research Assoc.	Michigan St.Univ.
Harvey, James		Hope College
Haun, Eugene	Assoc. Dean Stu.	Cornell Univ.
Hayward, John C.	Dean Stu. Affairs	Bucknell
Heberling, Paul M.	Dean of Men	Juniata College
Henderson, Charles	Dean Stu. Affairs	Univ. North Carolina
Henderson, John W.	Dean Stu. Per. Serv.	Western Ill. Univ.
Hendrix, Noble	Dean of Students	Univ. of Miami
Hennessey, John J. (Rev.)	Dean of Men	St. Mary's Univ.
Heusinkveld, Edwin D.	Dean of Men	Ferris Institute
*Hocutt, John E.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Delaware
Hogan, Thomas E.	Dean of Students	Ill. Inst. of Tech.
Hogg, Robert A.	Dir. Stu. Activ.	Monmouth College
Holmes, Robt. Wm.	Dean of Men	Mich. St. Univ. - Oakland
Hoogesteger, Howard H.	Dean of Students	Lake Forest College
Hotchkiss, Eugene	Dean of Students	Harvey Mudd College
*House, S.J.	Dean of Students	Newark Col. of Eng.
Hruby, John F.	Dean of Students	Wagner College
Huit, M. L.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Iowa
Hulet, Richard E.	Dean of Men	Ill. St. Normal Univ.
Ireland, Graham M.	Dean of Men	Westminster College
Isen, Leo	Conv. Reporter	Bona Fide Rptg. Co.
Ivey, Allen E.	Dir. of Couns.	Bucknell Univ.
*Jellison, Bill D.	Dean of Men	Ft. Hays Kan. St. Col.
Jenks, Dudley	Asst. Dean of Men	Drexel Inst. of Tech.
Johnson, Alan W.		Houston
Johnson, Dudley C.	Adviser of Men	Univ. of Akron
Kauffman, Joseph F.	Dir. of Training	Peace Corps
*Keiser, Ed C.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Cincinnati
Kennedy, Christopher F.	Dean of Freshmen	Northeastern Univ.
Kennedy, Pat	Chief Vol. Rel.	Peace Corps
Kerr, Kenneth M.	Asst. Head Couns.	Indiana University
Kidd, J. Thomas	Dean Stu. Affairs	Penn State
King, Raymond C.	Head Resident	Columbia Univ.
Kirk, David	Dean of Men	Marshall Univ.
Kitchen, Wilmer J.	Exec. Secy.	World Univ. Service
Klopf, Gordon	Assoc. Prof.	Teach. Col. - Columbia
Kluge, Donald A.	Dean of Men	Eastern Ill. Univ.
Knapp, William H.	Asst. Dir. Stu. Per.	Wayne State Univ.
Knerr, George F.	Dean Stu. Personnel	Pace College
*Knox, Carl W.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Illinois
Kramer, Fred P.	Dean of Students	MacAlester College
Krathwohl, Carlton L.	Research Assoc.	Syracuse Univ.
Kratochvil, Millard R.	Dir. Stu. Affairs	Iowa State Univ.
Kreuzer, James R.	Assoc. Dean of Stu.	Queens College

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Kropp, Theron L.	Asst.Coar.Scholar.	Lehigh University
Lacy, O. W. Bill	Dean of Students	Trinity College
Lambert, George F.		Rutgers University
Lane, Benjamin A.	Dean Stu.Affairs	Penn State
Lanier, Wm. J.	Grad. Student	Purdue University
Larimer, David S.	Asst.Dean of Men	Stanford University
Lauter, Charles F., Jr.	Asst.Dir.Res.Hall	Univ.of Rochester
Lavin, Leonard M.	Dean of Men	John Carroll Univ.
Lavin, James M.	Dir.Stu. Per.	John Carroll Univ.
Lawrence, Dave	Dean of Men	Univ.of Louisville
Leafgren, Frederick A.	Asst. Instr.	Michigan St.Univ.
Leasure, Daniel R.	Asst.Dean of Men	Penn State
Leathers, John	Dean of Students	Muskingum College
Lee, Juel	Asst.to Dean Men	Univ.of Illinois
*Leith, John D.	Dean of Students	Lehigh University
Letchworth, George E.	Dir. Residence	Temple University
Lippincott, William D.	Dean of Students	Princeton Univ.
Long, Robert O.	Dean of Students	Wittenberg Univ.
Long, William G.	Asst. Dean Stu.Aff.	Univ. North Carolina
Longley, Robert F.	Dean of Men	Univ.of Pennsylvania
Loos, Frank M.	Dean	Lincoln College
Loucks, Donald	Dean of Men	Florida St. Univ.
Luberg, Leroy E.	Dean of Students	Univ.of Wisconsin
Lucasse, Philip R.	Dean of Men	Calvin College
Lyons, Daniel	Dean of Students	Gonzaga University
MacDonald, Gilbert G.	Dean of Students	Northeastern Univ.
MacRae, James B.	Dean of Students	Lincoln University
Maguire, Bruce B.		Y.M.C.A.
Makuen, Donald R.	Counselor	Hunter College
Malloy, Edward J.	Dir.Ferris Booth Hall	Columbia College
Marshall, John E.	Dean of Men	Westminster Col.
Marsh, J. Don	Asst.Dean of Stu.	Wayne St.Univ.
Martin, Harvey T.	Act.Dean Students	Univ.of Denver
Martin, Leslie L.	Dean of Men	Univ.of Kentucky
Martinson, Wm. D.	Dir. of Couns.	Indiana Univ.
Masten, Sherman H.	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	Hofstra College
*Mathews, Forrest David	Asst.Dean of Men	Univ.of Alabama
Matson, Robert E.	Dean of Men	Carroll College
Matthews, Jack	Dean of Students	Univ. of Missouri
McAdams, Henry E.	Dean of Men	Northwestern Univ.
McBane, Robert A.	Dean of Students	Rider College
McCarrell, Ted	Exec.Dean Stu.Svs.	State Univ.of Iowa
McCloskey, Harry L.	Dean of Students	Loyola, Univ.
McCracken, Charles W.	Dean of Students	Trenton State Col.
McEvoy, Joseph, S.J.	Dean of Men	Canisius College
McFarland, Frank E.	Dean Stu.Affairs	Oklahoma St.Univ.
McGinnis, Benjamin G.	Dir. Stu.Fin.Aids	Kent State Univ.
McGrath, William H.	Asst.Dean of Stu.	Univ. So. Calif.
McGroartz, Wm. K.(Rev)	Dean of Students	Wheeling College

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
McIntosh, Richard To.	Dean of Students	Cedarville College
McKean, John R.O.	Dean of Students	Allegheny College
*McLeod, James C.	Dean of Students	Northwestern Univ.
McNamara, J.F.(Rev)	Dir.Stu.Welfare	Duquesne Univ.
McPadden, James J.	Dean of Men	Catholic Univ.
*Meese, Harold	Dean of Students	Mich.Col.Min.&Tech.
Meshank, William	Dir.Men's Housing	Drexel Inst.ofTech.
Metzger, Stanley	Dean of Students	Col. at Cortland
Meyn, Charles A.	Dean of Men	Bucknell Univ.
Mohoney, Arthur J.	Adm. Asst. D/M	Syracuse Univ.
Moore, Donald R.	Dir. Housing	Emory University
Moore, Francis A.,S.J.	Dean of Students	Univ. San Francisco
Moore, Norman C.		Wabash
Mosher, Bryan J.	Dean of Students	St.Univ.Col.-Oswego
Murphy, James T.	Dean of Men	Champlain College
Murphy, Raymond O.	Asst.Dean of Men	Penn State
Nair, Donald A.	Asst.Dean of Men	Lycoming College
Nelson, Clifford A.	Asst.Coor.Rel.Aff.	Penn State
Nester, William R.	Act.Dean of Men	Univ.of Cincinnati
Netherton, John P.	Assoc.Prof. Span.	Univ. of Chicago
Newman, James E.	Asst.Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Chicago
Niekerson, George T.	Dean of Men	Colby College
Niemi, Allan L.	Dean of Students	Northern Mich.Col.
Norton, Margaret	Exec.Natl St.YMCA	Natl.Stud.YMCA
Nowotny, Arno	Dean Stu. Life	Univ.of Texas
*Nygreen, Glen T.	Dean of Students	Kent State Univ.
O'Connor Brian R.	Asst.Head Couns.	Indiana Univ.
Oglesby, Ross R.	Dean of Students	Florida St.Univ.
Orwig, James P.	Dean of Men	Berea College
Ostafin, Peter A.	Asst.to V.Pres.	Univ. of Michigan
Pai, Young	Assoc.Dean of Col.	Park College
*Parks, Donald S.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Toledo
Parr, Preston	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	Lehigh University
Patzner, Roland D.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Vermont
Peace, James S.	Act.Dean of Stu.	City Col.of NewYork
Pearson, George	Dean of Men	Univ.Calif.(Riversd)
Pease, N. Ronald	Assoc.Dean of Men	Univ. Pittsburgh
Pederson, Gordon	Student	Boston University
Perry, Benjamin L.	Dean of Students	Florida A&M Univ.
Phillips, Robert A.	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	Maritime Col.-N.Y.
Pike, C. Milton	Dean of Men	Northern Ill.Univ.
Pillsbury, Wilbur	Dean of Students	Knox College
Pinckert, Robert C.	Assistant Dean	Columbia College
Pitcher, Robert W.	Dean of Students	Baldwin Wallace Col.
Playe, George L.	Dean Undergrad.Stu.	Univ. of Chicago
Pollock, O. Edward	Dean of Students	Union College
*Powers, Paul F.	Dean of Men	Alfred University
Price, Mitchell	Dir.Citizen.Pro.	Columbia College
Price, Philip	Dir.Stu.Activ.	New York Univ.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Quay, William L.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Lehigh University
Quehl, Gary H.	Grad. Asst. Res. Hl.	Indiana Univ.
Rabineau, Louis	V.P. Stu. Affairs	Pratt Institute
Rambo, Vinton H.	Dean of Men	Shippensburg Col.
Ratterman, P.H., S.J.	Dean of Men	Xavier University
Rea, Walter B.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Michigan
Reid, J. Juan	Dean of Men	Colorado College
Rhodes, Douglas W.	Asst. Head Couns.	Indiana Univ.
Rinfret, Melvyn P.	Dir. Housing	Rochester Inst. Tech
Rishel, Darrell F.	Dean of Students	Clarion St. College
Rivet, Hilton L., S.J.	Dean of Students	Spring Hill Col.
Roark, Eldridge W., Jr.	Coor. in Res. Hl.	Syracuse Univ.
Roberts, O.D.	Dean of Men	Purdue University
Robinson, David W.	Dean of Stu. Aff.	Emory University
Robinson, Donald W.	Spe. Stu. Services	U.S. Office-Educa.
Robinson, Eugene E.	Grad. Asst.	Purdue University
Rodgers, Allan W.	Dean of Men	Hamline Univ.
Rollins, J. Leslie	Asst. Dean	Harvard Grad. Sch. Bus.
Roskens, Ron	Dean of Men	Kent State Univ.
*Ross, Mylin H.	Dean of Men	Ohio State Univ.
Runk, B.F.D.	Dean of Univ.	Univ. of Virginia
Sales, Robert C.	Men's Res. Halls	Purdue Univ.
Sardo, Leonard P. (Rev)	Dean of Students	Col. of Steubenville
Saurman, Kenneth P.	Admissions Couns.	DePaul University
Saxton, Kenneth	Dean of Men	Geneva College
Scanlon, Joseph	Nat'l Exec. Secy.	Alpha Phi Omega
*Schmalfeld, Robert G.	Dean of Men	Heidelberg Col.
Schreck, Thomas C.	Dir. of Activ.	Indiana Univ.
Schwomeyer, Herbert F.	Dean of Men	Butler Univ.
Scully, James A.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Cincinnati
Sellers, R. Monroe	Dean of Students	Bethany College
Sells, Duncan	Dean of Students	Michigan St. Univ.- Oakland
Serra, Joseph	Asst. Dean of Men	Western Mich. Univ.
Sevrinson, C.A.	Dean of Students	N. Dakota St. Univ.
Seymour, Thaddeus	Dean of Col.	Dartmouth College
Shaffer, Robert H.	Dean of Students	Indiana University
Shainline, John W.	Dean of Students	Gettysburg Coll.
Sharp, Maurice J.	Dean of Students	Wayland College
Sharp, Richard L.	Res. Couns.	DePauw Univ.
Shearer, Rod E.	Dir. Res. Students	Univ. of Detroit
Sheeder, F. Thomas	Dean of Men	St. Univ. Col.- Fredonia
Shigley, E. Harold	Dean of Students	Marion College
Shirley, Warren H.	Assoc. Dean of Stu.	Florida A&M Col.
Sidles, Craig W.	Dean of Men	Cornell College
Sigglekow, Richard A.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Buffalo
Simes, Frank J.	Dean of Men	Penn State
Skinner, Donald W.	Dean of Men	Wagner College
Slonaker, Louis	Dean of Men	Univ. of Arizona

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Smith, David W.	Coor.of Men's Pro.	Trenton State Col.
Smith, Herbert E.	Ass't to Dean	Indiana University
Smith, Laurence C.	Dean of Students	Texas Christian U.
Smith, Mark	Dean of Men	Denison Univ.
Smith, Rex A.	Exec. Secy.	Sigma Alpha Epsilon
Solomon, Richard L.	Dir.Fin.Aid	Temple University
Sprandel, Walter B.	Dean of Men	Albion College
*Stafford, Edward E.	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Illinois
Stafford, John W.	Asst.Dean of Men	Ohio Wesleyan Univ.
Stamatakis, Louis C.	Dean of Men	Univ.of Wisconsin
Stanton, Floyd L.,S.J.	V.P.Student Af.	Marquette Univ.
Stead, Ronald S.	Dean of Men	Ohio Wesleyan Univ.
*Stewart, Harold E.	Dean of Students	Wayne State Univ.
*Stewart, James J.,Jr.	Dean of Stu.Aff.	North Carolina St.
*Stewart, John E.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Maine
*Stibbs, John H.	Dean of Students	Rulane Univ.
Summerskill, John	V.P.Stu. Affairs	Cornell University
Suttles, William M.	Dean of Students	Georgia St. Col.
Sutton, Donald M.	Dir.Stu.Activ.	Roanoke College
Swank, Earle R.	Dean of Men	Carnegie Inst.Tech.
Swartzbaugh, Wm. L.	Assoc. Dean	Amherst College
Tatham, David F.	Asst.Dean of Men	Syracuse Univ.
Taylor, Wallace W.		Bowling Green St.U.
Thomas, Charles W.	Asst. to Dean	Thiel College
*Thompson, Charles L.	Dean of Men	Hiram College
Thompson, Jorgen S.	Dean of Men	Augustana College
Thorn, Gordon R.	Asst.Dir..Stu.Aff.	West Va. Univ.
Toll, George S.	Exec. Secy.	Alpha Epsilon Pi
*Tomlin, George W.	Dean of Students	Univ.of So.Carolina
*Toombs, William	Dean of Men	Drexel Inst.ofTech.
Towle, Katherine A.	Dean of Students	Univ.Calif.-Berkeley
Tripp, Philip A.	Dean of Students	Washburn U.-Topeka
Troy, Howard C.	Asst.Dean Stu.	Lehigh University
Truitt, John W.	Dir.Men's Div. Stu. Affairs	Michigan State U.
Turner, Fred H.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Illinois
*Venderbush, Kenneth R.	Dean of Men	Lawrence College
Vetz, Joseph P., S.J.	Dean of Men	Univ.of Scranton
Voldseth, Edward	Dean of Students	Univ. Alaska
Wadleigh, Kenneth R.	Dean Stu.Affairs	Mass.Inst.of Tech.
Walt, Joseph W.	Asst. to Pres.	Simpson College
Watson, George H.	Dean of Students	Roosevelt Univ.
*Weaver, Fred J.	Secy. of Univ.	Univ. North Carolina
Weinstein, Stanley D.	Dir.Off.Stu.Per.	Brandeis Univ.
Wertimer, Sidney, Jr.	Assoc. Dean	Hamilton College
Whalen, Jerome P.	Asst.Dean of Men	Univ. Pittsburgh
Whittaker, Raymond C.	Dir.Stu.Activ.	Temple University
Widmar, Gary E.	Head Resident	Univ.of Illinois
Wilde, Roger K.	Asst.Dean Stu.	Fla.Southern Col.



<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Williamson, Edmund G.	Dean of Students	Univ. Minnesota
Williams, Thomas G.	Dean of Men	Coe College
Winbigler, H. Donald	Dean of Students	Stanford Univ.
Wise, W. Max	Professor	Columbia Univ.
Wood, Stephen B.	Dean of Men	Grinnell College
Woodruff, Laurence C.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Kansas
Womble, Hilburn	Asst. Dean of Men	Duke University
Wright, Ralph W.	Dean of Men	Kan. St. Col. of Pittsburg
Wright, William M.	Assoc. Dean of Stu.	DePauw University
Yanitelli, Victor R. S.J.	V.P. Stu. Personnel	Fordham University
Yarosz, Edward J.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Newark Col. of Eng.
*Yoke, Robert S.	Dir. Stu. Rel.	Gen. Mot. Inst.
Young, Donald F.	Dir. Gen. Serv.	Triangle Frat.
Young, Edward H.	Dean of Men	Lock Haven St. Col.
Young, Ralph A.	Dean of Men	Col. of Wooster
Zerman, Wm. S.	Exec. Secretary	Phi Gamma Delta
Zillman, Theodore	Dean of Men	Univ. of Wisconsin

- - - - -

\* Denotes wives in attendance.

# APPENDIX D

ROSTER OF MEMBERS, January, 1962  
(Revised March 26, 1962)

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
A. & M. College of Texas	Dean W.L. Penberthy Dean James Hannigan	College Station, Texas
Univ. of Akron	Dean R.L. Hansford	Akron, Ohio
Alabama College	V.P. Donfred Gardner Dean James Wilkinson	Montevallo, Ala.
Univ. of Alabama	Dean John Blackburn	University, Ala.
Alameda Cty.St.College	Dean Harry A. Grace	Hayward, Calif.
Univ. of Alaska	Dean Edward Voldseth	College, Alaska
Albion College	Dean W.B. Sprandel	Albion, Mich.
Alfred University	Dean Paul F. Powers	Alfred, New York
Allegheny College	Dean John McKean	Meadville, Pa.
Alma College	Dean Kent Hawley	Alma, Mich.
American Intl.College	Dean Charles Gadaire	Springfield,Mass.
American University	Dir. Ralph John	Washington, D.C.
Anderson College	Dir. Norman Beard	Anderson, Ind.
Arizona St. Univ.	Dean W.P. Shofstall	Tempe, Arizona
Univ. of Arizona	Dean Louis Slonaker	Tucson, Ariz.
Arkansas St. College	Dean Robert Moore	State College,Ark.
Univ. of Arkansas	Dean Whitney Halladay	Fayetteville,Ark.
Ashland College	Dean George M.Guiley	Ashland, Ohio
Atlantic Christian Col.	Dean of Students	Wilson, N. Car.
Auburn University	Dean James E. Foy	Auburn, Alabama
Augsburg College	Dean Peter Armacost	Minneapolis,Minn.
Augustana College	Dean Jorgen Thompson	Sioux Falls, S.D.
Baker University	Dean Ben. Gessner	Baldwin, Kansas
Baldwin-Wallace College	Dean Robt.W.Pitcher	Berea, Ohio
Ball St.Teach.College	Dean Glenn R. Ross	Muncie, Ind.
Baylor University	Pro. Monroe Carroll Dean W. C. Perry	Waco, Texas
Beloit College	Dean John P. Gwin	Beloit, Wis.
Berea College	Dean James P. Orwig	Berea, Kentucky
Bethany College	Dean R.Monroe Sellers	Bethany, W.Va.
Boston College	Dean Francis McManus S.J.	Boston, Mass.
Boston University	Dean Staton Curtis	Boston, Mass.
Bowling Green St.Univ.	Dean Donnal V. Smith	Bowling Green,O.
Bradley University	Dean Leslie Tucker	Peoria, Ill.
Brandeis University	Dir.Stanley Weinstein	Waltham, Mass.
Brigham Young Univ.	Dean Anton K. Ronney	Provo, Utah
Brooklyn Center, L.I.	Dir. John Hickey	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Brown University	Dean E.R. Durgin	Providence,R.I.
Bucknell University	Dean John Hayward	Lewisburg, Pa.
Univ. of Buffalo	Dean Richard Siggelkow	Buffalo, N.Y.
Butler University	Dean H. Schwomeyer	Indianapolis,Ind.
Calif.Inst.of Tech.	Dean Paul C. Eaton	Pasadena, Calif.
Calif.St.Polytechnic	Dean of Students	San Luis Obispo, Calif.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
Univ.of California	Dean Katherine Towle	Berkeley, Calif.
Univ.of California	Dean William Weir	Davis, Calif.
Univ.of California	Dean Byron Atkinson	Los Angeles, Calif.
Univ.of California	Dean Thomas Broadbent	Riverside, Calif.
Univ.of California Med. Center	Dean of Students	San Francisco, Cal.
Univ.of California Santa Barbara	Dean Lyle Reynolds	Goleta, Calif.
Calif. Western Col.	Dean A. Frederick Bunge	San Diego, Cal.
Calvin College	Dean Philip Lucasse	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Canisius College	Dir. Edward Gillen SJ	Buffalo, New York
Capital University	Dean John Kirker	Columbus, Ohio
Carleton College	Dean Merrill Jarchow	Northfield, Minn.
Carnegie Inst. of Tech.	Dean George Brown	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Carroll College	Dean Robt. E. Matson	Waukesha, Wis.
Carthage College	Dean James McElhaney	Carthage, Ill.
Case Inst. of Tech.	Dean Thomas E. Baker	Cleveland, Ohio
Catholic Univ. of Amer.	Jas. McPadden SJ	Washington, D.C.
Central Michigan Univ.	Dean Daniel Sorrells	Mt. Pleasant, Mich.
Central Missouri St. Col.	Dean W. O. Hampton	Warrensburg, Mo.
University of Chicago	Dean John Netherton	Chicago, Ill.
Chico State College	Dean John Bergstresser	Chico, Calif.
Univ. of Cincinnati	Dean William Nestor	Cincinnati, O.
City Col. of New York	Dean James S. Peace	New York, N.Y.
Clarkson Col. of Tech.	Dean F. Gordon Lindsey	Potsdam, N.Y.
Coe College	Dean Thomas Williams	Cedar Rapids, Ia.
Colby College	Dean George Nickerson	Waterville, Me.
Colgate University	Dean Wm. F. Griffith	Hamilton, N.Y.
Colorado State Univ.	Dean Robert Bates	Ft. Collins, Colo.
Colorado College	Dean Juan Reid	Colo. Springs, Col.
Colo. School of Mines	Dean W. V. Burger	Golden, Colo.
Univ. of Colorado	Dean Arthur Kiendl	Boulder, Colo.
	Dean Harold Angelo	
Columbia Univ.	Assoc. Edward Malloy	New York, N.Y.
Concordia Teach. Col.	Dean Carl Halter	River Forest, Ill.
The Cooper Union	Dr. Hollinger	New York, N.Y.
The Cooper Union for the Advancement of Art & Science	Dr. Richard S. Ball	New York, N.Y.
Cornell College	Dean Stuart Good	Mount Vernon, Ia.
Cornell University	Dean Patricia Cross	Ithaca, N.Y.
	V. P. Summerskill	
Creighton University	Dean Austin Miller SJ	Omaha, Nebr.
Culver-Stockton Col.	Dean H. Dale Almond	Canton, Mo.
C.W. Post Col. of L.I.	Dean Fred DeMarr	Greenvale, N.Y.
Dartmouth College	Dean Thaddeus Seymour	Hanover, N.H.
Dayton University	Dean Geo. Barrett SM	Dayton, Ohio
Univ. of Delaware	Dean John Hocutt	Newark, Dela.
Denison University	Dean Mark Smith	Granville, Ohio
Univ. of Denver	Dean of Students	Denver, Colo.
DePaul University	T. J. Wangler, CM	Chicago, Ill.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
DePauw University	Dean Lawrence Riggs Asst. Dean W. Wright	Greencastle, Ind.
Univ. of Detroit	Dean Thomas A. Emmet	Detroit, Mich.
Dickinson College	Dean Alan Coutts	Carlisle, Pa.
Doane College	Dean James Campbell	Crete, Nebr.
Drake University	Dean Paul Bloland	Des Moines, Iowa
Drexel Inst. of Tech.	Dean William Toombs	Philadelphia, Pa.
Drury College	Dean Thomas Watling	Springfield, Mo.
Duke University	Dean Robert Cox	Durham, No. Car.
Duquesne University	Dean Rev. J. McNamara	Pittsburgh, Pa.
<b>East Texas State</b>		
Teachers College	Dean J. W. Rollins	Commerce, Texas
Eastern Illinois Univ.	Dean Rudolph Anfinson	Charleston, Ill.
Eastern Michigan Col.	Dean Ralph Gilden	Ypsilanti, Mich.
Eastern New Mexico U.	Dean Darold Shutt	Portales, N.M.
East. Wash. Col. of Ed.	Dean Daryl Hagie	Cheney, Wash.
Elmhurst College	Dean Wm. F. Denman	Elmhurst, Ill.
Emory University	Dean David Robinson	Emory, Georgia
Emory & Henry Col.	Dean J. Gordon Brown	Emory, Virginia
Evansville College	Dir. Robert Thompson	Evansville, Ind.
Fairleigh Dickinson U.	Dean Clair W. Black	Rutherford, N.J.
Fisk University	Assoc. Dean Wm. Green	Nashville, Tenn.
Florida A&M Univ.	Dean Ben Perry	Tallahassee, Fla.
Fla. Southern Col.	Dean Abner H. Hansen	Lakeland, Fla.
Fla. State Univ.	Dean R. R. Oglesby	Tallahassee, Fla.
University of Florida	Dean Lester Hale	Gainesville, Fla.
Fordham University	V.P. Vic Yanitelli, SJ	New York, N.Y.
Ft. Hays Kansas State College	Dean Bill Jellison	Hays, Kansas
Fresno State College	Dean Leo Wolfson	Fresno, Calif.
General Motors Inst.	Dir. Robt. S. Yoke	Flint, Mich.
Georgetown Univ.	Dir. Arthur E. Gordon SJ	Washington, D.C.
George Washington U.	Dir. Ronald Faith	Washington, D.C.
Georgia Inst. of Tech.	Dean George Griffin Assoc. James Dull	Atlanta, Ga.
Georgia State College of Business Administration	Dean William Suttles	Atlanta, Ga.
Univ. of Georgia	Dean Joseph Williams Dean William Tate	Athens, Ga.
Gettysburg College	Dean John W. Shainline	Gettysburg, Pa.
Gonzaga University	Dean Daniel Lyons, SJ	Spokane, Wash.
Grinnell College	Dean Stephen Wood	Grinnell, Iowa
Grove City College	Dean Robert K. McKay	Grove City, Pa.
Hamilton College	Assoc. Dean S. Wertimer	Clinton, N.Y.
Hanover College	Dean Glenn L. Bonsett	Hanover, Ind.
Harvard College	Dean John U. Munro	Cambridge, Mass.
Hastings College	Dean Orin R. Stratton	Hastings, Nebr.
Univ. of Hawaii	Dean Harold Bitner	Honolulu, Hawaii
Henderson State Teachers Col.	Dean Paul Cauffiel	Arkadelphia, Ark.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
Hillsdale College	Dir. Robert Hendee	Hillsdale, Mich.
Hiram College	Dean Charles Thompson	Hiram, Ohio
Heidelberg College	Dean Robt. Schmalfeld	Tiffin, Ohio
Hofstra College	Dean Randall Hoffman	Hempstead, N.Y.
Hope College	Dean James Harvey	Holland, Mich.
Univ. of Houston	Dean J.E. Williamson	Houston, Texas
Howard University	Dean A.J. Blackburn	Washington, D.C.
Idaho State Col.	Dean Mel F. Schubert	Pocatello, Idaho
Univ. of Idaho	Dir. Chas. O. Decker	Moscow, Idaho
Illinois Inst. of Tech.	Dean	Chicago, Ill.
Ill. St. Normal Univ.	Dean Richard Hulet	Normal, Ill.
Univ. of Illinois	Dean Fred H. Turner	Urbana, Ill.
	Dean Carl W. Knox	
Univ. of Ill. Professional	Dean Maurice Galbraith	Chicago, Ill.
Univ. of Illinois Chi.		
Undergraduate	Dean Warren O. Brown	Chicago, Ill.
Ill. Wesleyan Univ.	Asst. Dean Diener	Bloomington, Ill.
Indiana State Col.	S. Trevor Hadley	Indiana, Pa.
Indiana University	Dean Robert Shaffer	Bloomington, Ind.
Indiana State Col.	Dean Mark Williams	Terre Haute, Ind.
InterAmerican Univ.		
of Puerto Rico	Dean Luis Sambolin	Mayaguez, Puerto R.
Iowa State College	Dir. Millard Kratochvil	Ames, Iowa
State Univ. of Iowa	Dean Marion L. Huit	Iowa City, Iowa
	Dirck W. Brown	
Kansas State Col.	Dean Herb Wunderlich	Manhattan, Kans.
Kansas St. Teach. Col.	Dean Victor Trusler	Emporia, Kans.
Kansas St. Teach. Col.	Dean Ralph Wright	Pittsburg, Kans.
Univ. of Kansas	Dean Laurence Woodruff	Lawrence, Kans.
	Dean Don Alderson	
Kansas Wesleyan Univ.	Dean John Courter	Salina, Kansas
Kent State University	Dean Glen Nygreen	Kent, Ohio
Univ. of Kentucky	Dean Leslie L. Martin	Lexington, Ky.
Kenyon College	Dean Thomas Edwards	Gambier, Ohio
Knox College	Dean Wilbur Pillsbury	Galesburg, Ill.
Lafayette College	Asst. T.O. Hourtoule	Easton, Pa.
Lake Forest Col.	Dean Howard Hoogesteger	Lake Forest, Ill.
Lamar State Col. of Tech	Dean D.L. Bost	Beaumont, Texas
Lawrence College	Dean Ken Venderbush	Appleton, Wis.
Lehigh University	Dean J. D. Leith	Bethlehem, Pa.
LeMoyne College	Robert E. Butler, SJ	Syracuse, N.Y.
Lenoir Rhyne College	Dean Frank Bretz	Hickory, N.C.
Lewis & Clark College	Dean Vergil Fogdall	Portland, Ore.
Long Beach St. Col.	Dean Karl Russell, Jr.	Long Beach, Cal.
Loras College	Dean Rev. Eugene Kutsch	Dubuque, Iowa
Louisiana Polytech. Inst.	Dean S.X. Lewis	Ruston, La.
Louisiana St. Univ.	Dean Arden O. French	Baton Rouge, La.
Univ. of Louisville	Dean Dave Lawrence	Louisville, Ky.
Loyola College	Rev. Frank Bourbon SJ	Baltimore, Md.
Loyola Univ. of L.A.	Dean Alfred Kilp SJ	Los Angeles, Cal.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
Loyola Univ.- New Orleans	Dean Robt. L. Boggs S.J.	New Orleans, La.
Loyola Univ.-Chicago	Dir. H. McClowskey	Chicago, Ill.
Lycoming College	Dean Jack C. Buckle	Williamsport, Pa.
MacMurray College	Dean David E. Long	Jacksonville, Ill.
Mankato State Col.	Dir. G.R. Schwartz	Mankato, Minn.
Univ. of Maine	Dean John Stewart	Orono, Maine
Manhattan College	Dean Geo.T. Eastment	New York, N.Y.
Maritime College	Dean Arthur Spring	Ft. Schuyler, N.Y.
Marquette University	Dean F.L. Stanton, S.J.	Milwaukee, Wis.
Marshall University	Dean David Kirk	Huntington, W. Va.
Univ. of Maryland	B. James Borreson	College Park, Md.
	Dean Geary Eppley	
Mass. Inst. of Tech.	Dean of Students	Cambridge, Mass.
Univ. of Massachusetts	Dean Robert Hopkins	Amherst, Mass.
McNeese State College	Dir. Ellis Guillory	Lake Charles, La.
Mercer University	Dean of Men	Macon, Georgia
Miami University	Dean Robert Etheridge	Oxford, Ohio
Univ. of Miami	Dean Noble Hendrix	Coral Gables, Fla.
	Dean Ben David	
Michigan Col. of Mining & Tech.	Dean Harold Meese	Houghton, Mich.
Michigan State Univ.	Dean Jack Fuzak	E. Lansing, Mich.
	Dir. John W. Truitt	
Univ. of Michigan	V.P. James Lewis	Ann Arbor, Mich.
	Dean W. B. Rea	
Middlebury College	Dean Thomas H. Reynolds	Middlebury, Vt.
Midwestern Univ.	Dean William Yardley	Wichita Falls, Tex.
Univ. of Minnesota	Dean E.G. Williamson	Minneapolis, Minn.
Univ. of Minnesota	Dir. C. W. Wood	Duluth, Minn.
Mississippi College	Dean Charles W. Scott	Clinton, Miss.
Univ. of Mississippi	Dean L. L. Love	University, Miss.
Mississippi South. Col.	Dean J.R. Switzer	Hattiesburg, Miss.
Univ. of Missouri	Dean Jack Matthews	Columbia, Mo.
Monmouth College	Dean Elwood H. Ball	Monmouth, Ill.
Montana State Col.	Dean Val Glynn	Bozeman, Mont.
Montclair St. Teach. Col.	Dean Leo G. Fuchs	Montclair, N.J.
Moravian College	Dean Marlyn D. Rader	Bethlehem, Pa.
Muhlenberg College	Dean Claude Dierolf	Allentown, Pa.
Muskingum College	Dir. John Leathers	New Concord, Ohio
Montana State Univ.	Dean Andrew Cogswell	Missoula, Mont.
Univ. of Nebraska	Dean J. P. Colbert	Lincoln, Nebr.
Nebraska Wesleyan U.	Dr. Delbert Sampson	Lincoln, Nebr.
Univ. of Nevada	Dean Sam Basta	Reno, Nevada
Newark Col. of Eng.	Dean S. J. House	Newark, N.J.
Univ. of New Hampshire	Dean Robb Gardiner	Durham, N.H.
New Mexico Highlands U.	Dean Ray Farmer	Las Vegas, N.M.
New Mexico St. Col. of Agric. & Mech. Arts	Dean Phillip S. Ambrose	State College, N.M.
Univ. of New Mexico	Dean Howard Mathany	Albuquerque, N.M.
New York University	Dir. Philip Price	New York, N.Y.
	Dean Donald Bullard	

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
No.Carolina St.Col.	Dean James Stewart	Raleigh, N.C.
Univ.of No.Carolina	Dean Chas.Henderson,Jr.	Chapel Hill,N.C.
	Sec'y Fred H. Weaver	
North Dakota St.Univ.	Dean C.A. Sevrinson	Fargo, N.D.
Univ.of North Dakota	Dean Charles Lewis	Grand Forks,N.D.
Northeast Louisiana State College	Dean Fred J. Vogel	Monroe, La.
Northeastern Univ.	Dean Gilbert MacDonald	Boston, Mass.
Northern Illinois U.	V.P. Ernest E. Hanson	DeKalb, Ill.
	Dean C. Milton Pike	
Northern Montana Col.	Dean John W. Stair	Havre, Montana
Northwestern St.Col.	Dir.Dudley G. Fulton	Natchitoches,La.
Northwestern Univ.	Dean James McLeod	Evanston, Ill.
Oberlin College	Dean W.D. Holdeman	Oberlin, Ohio
Occidental College	Dean Robert S. Ryf	Los Angeles,Cal.
Ohio State University	Dean John T. Bonner	Columbus, Ohio
	Dean Mylin H. Ross	
Ohio University	Dean William Butler	Athens, Ohio
Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	Dean Ronald Stead	Delaward, Ohio
Oklahoma State Univ.	Dean F.E. McFarland	Stillwater, Okla.
Oklahoma Baptist Univ.	Dean Donald G. Osborn	Shawnee, Okla.
Oklahoma City Univ.	Dean Bob Jones	Oklahoma City,Okla.
Univ. of Oklahoma	Dean Clifford Craven	Norman, Okla.
Univ.of Omaha	Dean Don Pflasterer	Omaha, Nebr.
Oregon State College	Dean Don Poling	Corvallis, Ore.
University of Oregon	Dean Donald DuShane	Eugene, Oregon
	Dean N. Roy Hawk	
University of Ottawa	Dean Leonard DuCharme	Ottawa, Canada
	OMI	
Pace College	Dean George F. Knerr	New York, N.Y.
College of Pacific	Dean Edward Betz	Stockton,Calif.
Pacific University	Dean C.Bryce Dunham	Forest Grove,Ore.
Pa.State University	Dean Frank Simes	Univ.Park, Pa.
Univ.of Pennsylvania	Dean Robt.F. Longley	Philadelphia,Pa.
Univ.of Pittsburgh	Dr. William B. Crafts	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Polytechnic Inst. of Brooklyn	Dean Henry Middendorf	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Polytechnic Inst. of Puerto Rico	Dean B. B. Palmer	SanGerman, P.R.
Pomona College	Dean Shelton Beatty	Claremont,Calif.
Portland St.Col.	Dean Charles Bursch	Portland, Oregon
Pratt Institute	V.P. Louis Robineau	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Princeton University	Dean Wm. Lippincott	Princeton, N.J.
The Principia	Dean Allen C. Brooks	Elsah, Illinois
Purdue University	Dean Donald Mallett	Lafayette, Ind.
	Dean O. D. Roberts	
Queens College	Dean James Kreuzer	Flushing, N.Y.
Univ.of Redlands	Dean Robt. Goodridge	Redlands, Calif.
Renssalaer Poly.Inst.	Dean Ira Harrod	Troy, N.Y.
Regis College	Dean Bernard Karst	Denver, Colo.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
Univ.of Rhode Island	Dean John Quinn	Kingston, R.I.
Univ.of Richmond	Dean C. J. Gray	Richmond, Va.
Richmond Prof. Inst.	Dean Richard MacDonald	Richmond, Va.
Rider College	Dean Robert McBane	Trenton, N.J.
Ripon College	Dean David Harris	Ripon, Wis.
Roanoke College	Dir. Donald M. Sutton	Salem, Va.
Univ. of Rochester	Dean Joseph Cole	Rochester, N.Y.
Rochester Inst.ofTech.	Dir. Melvyn Renfret	Rochester, N.Y.
Rockford College	Dean Stanley J. Gross	Rockford, Ill.
Rollins College	Dean Dyckman Vermilye	Winter Park, Fla.
Roosevelt University	Dean George Watson	Chicago, Ill.
Rutgers University	Dean Cornelius Boocock	New Brunswick, N.J.
	Assoc. Edgar Curtin	
Sacramento State Col.	Dean of Students	Sacramento, Calif.
St.Lawrence Univ.	Dean of Men	Canton, N.Y.
St.Louis University	Dean M.B. Martin, SJ	St. Louis, Mo.
St.Olaf College	Dean Mark Alml	Northfield, Minn.
St.Mary's University	Dean Henry Ringkamp, SM	San Antonio, Tex.
St.Peter's College	Dean Gerald Fagan, SJ	Jersey City, N.J.
St.Procopius College	Dean V. Skluzacek, OSB	Lisle, Ill.
San Diego State Col.	Dean Herbert Peiffer	San Diego, Calif.
SanFernando Valley State College	Dean John T. Palmer	Northridge, Calif.
SanFrancisco St.Col.	Dean Fred Reddell	SanFrancisco, Cal.
Univ.of San Francisco	Dean Francis A. Moore, SJ	" "
San Jose St. Col.	Dean Stanley C. Benz	San Jose, Calif.
	Robert Martin	
Univ.of Santa Clara	V.P. Wilfred Crowley, SJ	Santa Clara, Cal.
Univ.of Scranton	Dean Rev. James Donahoe	Scranton, Pa.
Shepherd College	Dean Ornsby L. Harry	Shepherdstown, W. Va.
Shimer College	Dean Curtis W. R. Larson	Mt. Carroll, Ill.
Simpson College	A/P Joseph W. Walt	Indianola, Iowa
Univ.of So. Carolina	Dean George W. Tomlin	Columbia, S.C.
Southeastern La. Col.	Dean L.E. Chandler	Hammond, La.
St.Univ.of South Dak.	Dean Howard Connors	Vermillion, S.D.
Univ.of Southern Cal.	Dean Robert J. Downey	Los Angeles, Cal.
Southern Conn. St. Col.	Dean Roy R. Senour	New Haven, Conn.
Southern Ill. Univ.	Dean I. Clark Davis	Carbondale, Ill.
Southern Methodist U.	Dean Mayne Longnecker	Dallas, Texas
Southwestern College	Donald L. Colburn	Winfield, Kans.
Southwestern La., Univ.	Dean E. Glynn Abel	Lafayette, La.
Springfield College	Dean R. W. Cheney	Springfield, Mass.
Spring Hill College	Dean Hilton Rivet, SJ	Spring Hill, Ala.
Stanford University	Dean Donald Winbigler	Stanford, Calif.
	Dean William Craig	
State Teachers Col.	Dean Samuel M. Long	Mansfield, Pa.
State Teachers Col.	Dean Dan J. Sillers	Minot, N. Dak.
St.Univ.of N.Y.-L.I. Cen.	Dean Allen Austill	Oyster Bay, N.Y.
St.Univ. Teachers Col.	Dean Charles LaMorte	Buffalo, N.Y.
St.Univ. Teachers Col.	Dean A. W. Baisler	Cortland, N.Y.
State Univ. Teach. Col.	Dean Gerald Saddle	Geneseo, N.Y.
State Teachers Col.	Dean Norman E. Whitten	Oswego, N.Y.



<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
John B. Stetson Univ.	Dean George Hood	DeLand, Florida
State Teachers Col.	Dean Vinton H. Rambo	Shippensburg, Pa.
Steubenville, Col. of	Dean Rev. Leonard Sardo	Steubenville, O.
Stevens Inst. of Tech.	Dean Charles Weelhausen	Hoboken, N.J.
Syracuse University	Dean Earle W. Clifford	Syracuse, N.Y.
Taylor University	Dean William Green	Upland, Ind.
Temple University	Dean Carl M. Grip	Philadelphia, Pa.
Univ. of Tennessee	Dean R. E. Dunford	Knoxville, Tenn.
Tennessee Wesleyan Col.	Dean Floyd Bowling	Athens, Tenn.
Texas Christian Univ.	Dean Laurence Smith	Ft. Worth, Texas
Texas Col. of Arts & Ind.	Dean J. E. Turner	Kingsville, Tex.
Texas Tech. College	Dean James Allen	Lubbock, Texas
University of Texas	Dean Arno Nowotny	Austin, Texas
Thiel College	Dean J. B. Stoeber	Greenville, Pa.
Univ. of Toledo	Dir. Donald S. Parks	Toledo, Ohio
Trenton St. College	Dean Charles McCracken	Trenton, N.J.
Trinity College	Dr. O. W. Lacy	Hartford, Conn.
Troy St. College	Dean Lewis Godlove	Troy, Alabama
Tufts University	Dean Clifton Emery	Medford, Mass.
Tulane University	Dean John H. Stibbs	New Orleans, La.
University of Tulsa	Dean Harry Carter	Tulsa, Okla.
Union College	Dean M. S. Culver	Lincoln, Nebr.
Union College	Dean Edward Pollock	Schenectady, N.Y.
U.S. Air Force Academy	Col. U. J. O'Connor	Denver, Colo.
Upsala College	Dean Harold Carlson	E. Orange, N.J.
Utah St. Agric. Col.	Dean J. Elliot Cameron	Logan, Utah
	Ass't John R. Williams	
Universite Laval	Dean Jean-Charles Bouffard	
		Quebec, Canada
University of Utah	Dean W. W. Blaesser	Salt Lake City,
	Assoc. Burns Crookston	Utah
Valparaiso Univ.	Dean Luther Koepke	Valparaiso, Ind.
Vanderbilt Univ.	Dean	Nashville, Tenn.
Univ. of Vermont	Dean Roland Patzer	Burlington, Vt.
Univ. of Virginia	Dir. B. F. Runk	Charlottesville,
		Virginia
Virginia Poly. Inst.	Dir. James W. Dean	Blacksburg, Va.
Wabash College	Dean Norman C. Moore	Crawfordsville,
		Inc.
Wagner College	Dean K. W. Johnson	Staten Is., N.Y.
Washburn Univ. of Topeka	Dean Philip A. Tripp	Topeka, Kansas
Washington & Lee U.	Dean Edward C. Atwood	Lexington, Va.
Washington St. Univ.	Dean J. C. Clevenger	Pullman, Wash.
Washington College	Dean Albert Hill	Chestertown, Md.
Washington Univ.	Dean Arno J. Haack	St. Louis, Mo.
Univ. of Washington	Dean Donald K. Anderson	Seattle, Wash.
Wayland Baptist Col.	Dean Maurice J. Sharp	Plainview, Tex.
Wayne State Univ.	Dean Harold Stewart	Detroit, Mich.
Western Illinois Univ.	Dean John Henderson	Macomb, Ill.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Address</u>
Western Maryland Col.	Dean William M. David	Westminster, Md.
Western Michigan Univ.	Dean J. Towner Smith	Kalamazoo, Mich.
	Dean Paul I. Griffith	
Western Reserve Univ.	Dean R. A. Griffin	Cleveland, Ohio
Westminster College	Dean John E. Marshall	Fulton, Mo.
West Virginia Univ.	Dir. Joseph C. Gluck	Morgantown, W. Va.
Wheaton College	Dean Arthur Volle	Wheaton, Ill.
Univ. of Wichita	Dir. Student Services	Wichita, Kansas
Col. of William & Mary	Dean Carson Barnes, Jr.	Williamsburg, Va.
Wilmington College	Dean Norbert K. Baumgart	Wilmington, Ohio
Univ. of Wisconsin	Dean Leroy E. Luber	Madison, Wis.
Univ. of Wisconsin	Dean Theodore Zillman	Madison, Wis.
Univ. of Wisconsin	Dean L. C. Stamatakis	Milwaukee, Wis.
Wittenberg Univ.	Dean Robert Long	Springfield, O.
College of Wooster	Dean Ralph A. Young	Wooster, Ohio
Univ. of Wyoming	Dean A. L. Keeney	Laramie, Wyoming
Xavier University	Dean P. H. Ratterman, S. J.	Cincinnati, Ohio
Mr. William S. Guthrie	36 East Gay Street	Columbus 15, Ohio

HONORARY MEMBERS:      H. Roe Bartle  
                                     Alvin Duerr

# APPENDIX E

## SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Meet- ing	Year	Pres- ent	Place	President	Secretary
1	1919	6	Madison, Wisconsin	S.H. Goodnight	L.A. Strauss
2	1920	9	Urbana, Illinois	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
3	1921	16	Iowa City, Iowa	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
4	1922	20	Lexington, Ky.	E.E. Nicholson	S.H. Goodnight
5	1923	17	Lafayette, Ind.	Stanley Coulter	E.E. Nicholson
6	1924	29	Ann Arbor, Mich.	J.A. Bursley	E.E. Nicholson
7	1925	31	Chapel Hill, N.C.	Robert Rienow	F.F. Bradshaw
8	1926	46	Minneapolis, Minn.	C.R. Melcher	F.F. Bradshaw
9	1927	43	Atlanta, Georgia	Floyd Field	F.F. Bradshaw
10	1928	50	Boulder, Colorado	S.H. Goodnight	F.M. Dawson
11	1929	75	Washington, D.C.	C.B. Culver	V.I. Moore
12	1930	64	Fayetteville, Ark.	J.W. Armstrong	V.I. Moore
13	1931	83	Knoxville, Tenn.	W.J. Sanders	V.I. Moore
14	1932	40	Los Angeles, Calif.	V.I. Moore	D.H. Gardner
15	1933	55	Columbus, Ohio	C.E. Edmondson	D.H. Gardner
16	1934	61	Evanston, Ill.	H.E. Lobdell	D.H. Gardner
17	1935	56	Baton Rouge, La.	B.A. Tolbert	D.H. Gardner
18	1936	92	Philadelphia, Pa.	W.E. Alderman	D.H. Gardner
19	1937	80	Austin, Texas	D.S. Lancaster	D.H. Gardner
20	1938	164	Madison, Wisconsin	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
21	1939	87	Roanoke, Virginia	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
22	1940	58	Albuquerque, N.Mex.	F.J. Findlay	F.H. Turner
23	1941	100	Cincinnati, Ohio	J.J. Thompson	F.H. Turner
24	1942	114	Urbana, Illinois	L.S. Corbett	F.H. Turner
25	1943	101	Columbus, Ohio	J.A. Park	F.H. Turner
26	1944	96	Chicago, Illinois	J.H. Julian	F.H. Turner
27	1945	Due to	Office of Defense Transportation	No Meeting	Held
28	1946	142	Lafayette, Indiana	Earl J. Miller	F.H. Turner
29	1947	170	Ann Arbor, Mich.	Arno Nowotny	F.H. Turner
30	1948	173	Dallas, Texas	E.L. Cloyd	F.H. Turner
31	1949	217	Highland Park, Ill.	J.H. Newman	F.H. Turner
32	1950	210	Williamsburg, Va.	L.K. Neidlinger	F.H. Turner
33	1951	222	St. Louis, Mo.	W.P. Lloyd	F.H. Turner
34	1952	180	Colo. Springs, Colo.	A. Blair Knapp	F.H. Turner
35	1953	245	East Lansing, Mich.	V.F. Spathelf	F.H. Turner
36	1954	231	Roanoke, Virginia	R.M. Strozier	F.H. Turner
37	1955	230	Lafayette, Ind.	J.H. Stibbs	F.H. Turner
38	1956	201	Berkeley, Calif.	J.E. Hocutt	F.H. Turner
39	1957	231	Durham, N. Carolina	F.C. Baldwin	F.H. Turner
40	1958	306	French Lick, Ind.	D.M. Du Shane	F.H. Turner
41	1959	303	Boston, Mass.	F.H. Turner	C.W. Knox
42	1960	367	Columbus, Ohio	H.D. Winbigler	C.W. Knox
43	1961	303	Colo. Springs, Colo.	W.S. Guthrie	C.W. Knox
44	1962	408	Philadelphia, Pa.	F.H. Weaver	C.W. Knox